

BLACKFRIARS

A MONTHLY REVIEW

Edited by the English Dominicans



February 1935 Contents

Editorial

The Approach to Reunion

Henry St. John, O.P.

Catholicism and Protestantism in the Modern World

Oskar Bauhofer

After Four Hundred Years

Aelwin Tindal-Atkinson, O.P.

St. Wanderlust

Finbar Synnott, O.P.

Material Thoughts

Vincent Basevi

The Conventional Stage

Hilary Pepler

A United Front

T. C. Walter

EXTRACTS AND COMMENTS. CORRESPONDENCE: The League of Nations and the National Declaration. REVIEWS: Theology and Religion, Philosophy, Miscellaneous, The Play, Gramophone.

NOTICES.

OXFORD
Blackfriars

LONDON
Rolls House, E.C.4

Vol. XVI, No. 179. Price One Shilling.

Yearly Subscription, Twelve Shillings

In America: 25 Cents a Copy

Subscription 3 Dollars

G.K.'s WEEKLY

EDITED by
G. K. CHESTERTON

March 21st, 1925—————

—————*March 21st, 1935*

SPECIAL
10th Anniversary Number

MARCH 21st

A Summary of Ten Years

—————
Orders for this number should
be placed immediately

—————
PRICE SIXPENCE, as usual

G.K.'s WEEKLY, 2 LITTLE ESSEX STREET,
STRAND, LONDON, W.C.2

SCHOOLS FOR GIRLS

BIRKDALE, Southport, Lancs. **CONVENT OF NOTRE DAME**. Pleasantly situated within five minutes of the sea. Pupils prepared for Oxford Locals, Association Board, Royal Drawing Society. Elocution. Riding. Swimming. For further particulars apply to:

THE SISTER SUPERIOR.

CLAPHAM COMMON, S.W.4. **CONVENT OF NOTRE DAME**. Boarding School for Girls, standing in extensive grounds. Preparation for Public Examinations. Ample facilities for Games. Separate Day School for Girls and Little Boys. Apply:

THE SISTER SUPERIOR.

HARROW-ON-THE-HILL, Middlesex. **ST. DOMINIC'S CONVENT**. Boarding and Day School for Young Ladies. Bracing air; spacious grounds. Pupils prepared for any Public Examinations. Matriculation, Drawing, Music. Liberal Education. Also Commercial. Apply: THE MOTHER PRIORESS, O.P.

UNIVERSITY HOSTEL

OXFORD. **CONVENT OF NOTRE DAME**, 145 and 147 Woodstock Road. Under the patronage of His Grace the Archbishop of Birmingham, a University Hostel exclusively for Religious is conducted by the Sisters of Notre Dame. For particulars apply to the SISTER SUPERIOR as above.

THE POPE CONGRATULATES

'... the valiant workers in this form of Catholic Action and all the many helpers of the Catholic Truth Society. His most earnest desire is that they should do *still more and still better*' (Jubilee Message to the C.T.S.)

A worthy response to this appeal by the Holy Father depends upon a *greatly increased membership*, and the Society will be grateful for YOUR co-operation. Full particulars from

CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY

38-40 Eccleston Square : London, S.W.1

The

New

Catholic Herald

*'A paper which has been improved
almost incredibly during the last
half year' (The Tablet, Jan. 5th,
1935).*

¶ A free specimen copy will be gladly sent to any
reader of *Blackfriars* who is interested in this new
journalistic enterprise.

SUBSCRIPTION ORDER.

To the Publishers, *Catholic Herald*, 110, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.

Enclosed please find remittance for 52 weeks—13/-.

„ „ „ „ „ 26 „ — 6/6.

„ „ „ „ „ 18 „ — 3/8.

subscription to the *Catholic Herald*.

Name

Address

Date

BLACKFRIARS

(With which is incorporated *The Catholic Review*)

Literary Communications should be addressed to THE EDITOR, BLACKFRIARS, OXFORD. Telephone 3607. The Editor cannot be responsible for the loss of MSS. submitted. No MSS. will be returned unless accompanied by a stamped addressed envelope.

Single copies of BLACKFRIARS may be obtained through any bookseller, price One Shilling, in America Twenty-five Cents. *Yearly subscription*, Twelve Shillings, in America Three Dollars, may be sent to The Rolls House Publishing Co., Ltd., Rolls House, 2 Breems Buildings, London, E.C.4.

Communications in regard to *Advertisements* should be addressed to The Rolls House Publishing Co., Ltd., 2 Breems Buildings, London, E.C.4. Telephone Holborn 5708, 5709, 0603. Telegrams 'Publimerdi, London.'

Vol. XVI, No. 179.

February 1935.

EDITORIAL

CARDINAL BOURNE'S death marks the close of thirty years of English Catholic history to which in the future his name will no doubt be affixed. Already his long rule at Westminster can be seen to have something of the unity and consistency which we associate, for instance, with the Manning period. His consciousness of being a Londoner, the absorption of the old Catholic tradition at Ushaw and Old Hall (and perhaps also his period of novitiate with the English Dominicans), served to anchor him in the life of England. A clear understanding of English habits of thought and outlook contributed to his marked success in dealing with changing governments and to his universal prestige in the non-Catholic world.

It is of particular and personal interest to us to remark that such qualities, added to a deeply spiritual character, were undoubtedly responsible for the great and unvaried confidence which he placed in Father Bede Jarrett, O.P., to whom he was attached so strongly. They met for the first time thirty years ago, one evening at Imberhorn, when Francis Bourne was Bishop of Southwark and Cyril Jarrett was leaving Stonyhurst. Their personal friendship then begun was sustained, and years later Father Bede, become now almost in spite of himself an acknowledged exponent of Catholic truth, was encouraged and sustained by his

BLACKFRIARS

sympathy with all that the Cardinal represented and by a serene trust in his judgement. It might even seem symbolic that the Cardinal presided, in 1921 and in 1929, on the two principal occasions of the re-founding of the Oxford Blackfriars.

It was characteristic of the period to which both belonged that their English traits were tempered as well as emphasized by their foreign contacts. In the case of the Cardinal the influence of Saint Sulpice led to the care which he gave to the question of the training of priests, and his sympathetic understanding of French Catholicism was in part responsible for his great success as the spiritual leader of the English Catholics during the European War. Throughout his rule his conduct of affairs was marked by a judgement rather conservative in its mould, according with sound traditional opinion, and by a care that his words and writings should be worthy of the office with which God had entrusted him. A deep and personal interest in spiritual matters and the saintliness so manifest in him could alone have given him that constant strength and wonderfully equable temper with which he bore so worthily the burden of his pastoral charge. *Requiescat in pace.*



Firm in our conviction of the interest and importance of this question, we are happy to offer our readers in this issue three noteworthy articles on Christian unity. While Father St John reiterates his point of view in a careful statement, it is instructive to read along with it the consentient opinions of a Catholic Bishop and of a Catholic Professor domiciled in a country where the issue is as alive as in our own.

EDITOR.

THE APPROACH TO REUNION¹

I

THE new regroupings of the future are forming themselves round two clearly defined rallying points. One of these is materialism, which attracts those who have ceased to fix their eyes on a life beyond this life. The other is Christianity, towards which are gravitating those who cannot be satisfied with a materialistic explanation of the world, and who believe that in, and around, and beyond its life lies another and more perfect life, in which we are in some way sharers. The materialist grouping is as yet only a nucleus, but it has a coherent creed, a crusading spirit and definite unity of aim. In strong contrast with this small, active, homogeneous nucleus, steadily extending its circle of influence, is the huge army of Christendom, full of supernatural vitality and heroic effort, but handicapped by internal dissension, reduced sometimes almost to impotence; and unable to move forward in strength and unity on its mission to convert the world to Christ.

Is it any wonder that there is an increasing number of men and women in every one of the many sections into which Christendom is divided, who are turning their thoughts more and more to the problem of reunion? They see that to remain as we are, divided and crippled in our efforts, is not merely to court the disaster of being overwhelmed by the forces of pagan materialism, but is a betrayal of our Blessed Lord's commission, who has bidden us go and teach all nations, not go bewilder them with the multiplicity of our doctrines and the conflict of our many opinions.

Many of us regard reunion as the most primary and vital of all the problems that Christianity must attempt to solve in the near future. And yet we are well aware of the complications of the problem and its many difficulties. Each of

¹ The substance of a paper read to the Reunion Society, Oxford, November 26th, 1934.

us regards as fundamental to Christianity some part of the special contribution which his own section of Christendom makes to the whole, because he believes that that part was designed by our Lord to be an essential element in the religion which He founded. If we are sincere Christians we know that we cannot give way, by a fraction of an inch, upon those things which we believe to have been sanctioned as necessary in Christ's intention. Any disunion among Christians will result, in some sense, in a corporate betrayal of our Lord's commission to teach the truth to all nations, but it would be a far worse betrayal of Him to sacrifice, in the interests of an artificial unity, any truth which we believe Him to have committed to the care of His Church.

The path of those, then, who would pursue the cause of the reunion of Christendom is beset by difficulties. These can only be overcome by our blessed Lord Himself, in the measure in which we allow Him by the power of His Spirit to enlighten our minds and fire our wills; till our minds begin to see the situation as He sees it and our wills begin to burn with the love that fires His Will.

The chief obstacles, apart from our individual sinfulness, which prevent Him from bringing our minds and wills into conformity with His own are the prejudices, the misunderstandings, the inherited traditions, which are integral to our surroundings and the atmosphere in which we pass our lives. These things often generate a corporate pride and even arrogance, which hinder the work of God's grace, and are very hard for us to break through. We shall only do so by a firm determination to get outside our normal surroundings and make contacts of sympathy and understanding with those whose environment is very different from our own. Then we shall begin to understand what they hold so dear and prize so highly, and why they hold it with such firm conviction; what they view with fear and suspicion, and why they shrink from it instinctively; and the knowledge so gained will generate in us sympathy, understanding and generally respect. On this groundwork in the hearts of men the power of the Holy Ghost can work,

THE APPROACH TO REUNION

and where such material is found He will cause the truth to emerge from the chaos of conflicting opinion so that all may see and accept it. It is in this spirit and with these presuppositions that I should like to envisage the subject.²

For Roman Catholics there can be no ultimate disagreement as to what is of faith, and no hesitation in holding with our whole heart and mind what has been defined as of faith by the Church. But defined dogmas come naturally to be applied by fallible minds to the infinitely varying circumstances of human life, and in that application there may arise deep and far-reaching differences of outlook, method, and approach. It is both natural and inevitable that this should be. The apprehension of truth by single human minds, or groups of minds, is often likely to be partial, and its application to particular problems one-sided and unbalanced in emphasis. It will be obvious, then, that among Roman Catholics, though there is necessarily unanimity in regard to the truths of faith, there are deeply rooted differences of idea as to how the problems which arise from the application of dogma to life should be approached. In treating, therefore, of the subject of reunion my fundamental principle will be the defined doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church, but my approach to the problem, which is my application of this doctrine to present day circumstances in England, is my own.

The problem is far less one of sheer dogma than we are sometimes inclined to think. True, the dogmas about which we differ are there, clear cut and uncompromising, though for many Anglicans the Oxford Movement has reduced them in number, in some cases almost to vanishing point.

² In order to avoid all misunderstandings, may I say here that to a meeting such as that of the Reunion Society, where not all are of the same religious allegiance, I used for convenience the terminology which is ordinarily adopted amongst Englishmen. I speak of bishops and priests, Anglo-Catholics and Roman Catholics, the Church of England and the Church of Rome, without inverted commas, and entirely without prejudice to the various convictions in the many controversies which centre round the realities that these words represent.

But the controversy about them has divided us for nearly four centuries into two opposing camps, and for nearly four centuries we have been steadily growing apart, each developing our own distinctive ethos and atmosphere, our own peculiar misconceptions and misjudgements of the others' ideas and motives, and now as corporate societies we face each other, hostile and suspicious, while the forces of materialism gather strength.

The first thing that must be done in our work for reunion is to break down and clear away the barriers of mutual suspicion and prejudice which divide us, and those barriers can only be broken down by the more complete understanding of each other which comes from personal contacts. When these contacts have been established we shall still be divided on fundamental questions of dogma, but we shall have created between ourselves a disposition of heart, a true friendship and an understanding of each other's point of view; a congenial groundwork upon which the Holy Spirit can work. This is the essential preliminary to any talk of reunion, and without it we cannot even approach the problem.

II

I believe that the greatest obstacle to such an approach is the widespread feeling that Roman Catholics tend to minimize or deny the workings of divine grace in Anglicans. This feeling may be summarized in the words of a responsible writer,³ who describes as the way of absorption what he calls the ordinary Roman attitude to reunion. 'The Way of Absorption is a false way,' he says, 'because it implies that the truth of Christianity lies entirely on one side, and involves a denial that the Holy Spirit has taught the other side anything worth having.'

Now it is Catholic dogma that grace and truth come to us through Jesus Christ by the working of the Holy Spirit,

³ *Intercommunion*, by A. G. Hebert, S.S.M., Ch. ix, p. 121.

THE APPROACH TO REUNION

and it is also Catholic dogma that those who are baptized (whether in fact or by desire) are incorporated into the mystical Body of Christ and made His members by sanctifying grace. The only thing that can cut off a baptized person from the sanctifying grace which unites him to our blessed Lord is mortal sin. Unless, then, a Roman Catholic has the right, and he can have no such right, to say of an Anglican, 'He is in mortal sin,' he has no sort of business to minimize the extent or deny the existence in him of sanctifying grace. And since the possession of sanctifying grace implies the presence of the virtues, and the gifts of the Holy Ghost, it follows that whatever truth an Anglican holds by divine faith has been taught him by the Holy Ghost, and if he has learned that truth through the Church of England, then the Holy Ghost has made the Church of England His instrument for teaching it.

We believe that in the confusion and upheaval of doctrine which accompanied the Reformation the apostolic succession in the Church of England was broken, and that in consequence (apart from Baptism and Marriage) the sacraments of the Church of England are not vehicles of sacramental grace. But though *we* are bound to the sacraments, God Himself is not, and we have no warrant for saying that Almighty God does not reward the faith and devotion of those who use these ordinances by granting the graces for which they ask Him, and which they believe to be conveyed by them. Such graces would not, of course, be sacramental—in the sense that they would not be conveyed through the sacraments. So far, then, from denying or minimizing the spiritual life of Anglicans, a Roman Catholic must acknowledge that both it and the objective grace which causes it may be as deep and full as his own. The difference between us lies chiefly in this; that many Anglicans tend to regard experience as the guarantee of the validity of sacraments and of grace received; it has become for them an ultimate criterion, while for us though it is recognized as evidence in its own limited sphere, it is not wholly reliable evidence, unless supported and authenticated by the external authority of the Church.

It is an essential part of our faith that Our Lord founded a visible Church—a society, kingdom or body, which should remain through the ages organically one, in this sense; that as a society, or kingdom, or living organism cannot be divided and yet retain its identity, so the Church must always remain indivisible; portions may be rent away by schism, but its unity remains unimpaired though its life may be terribly weakened. This visible organic unity, so we believe, was our Lord's plan for His Church because He knew it to be the only way by which His truth and grace could be preserved and the means of their propagation guaranteed.

But the visible Church is only a part of the mystical Body of Christ, and the mystical Body of Christ is far wider in its extension than the visible Church. We believe that those who are separated from the unity of the visible Church, for any reason short of mortal sin, are nevertheless united by grace to the mystical Body of Christ, and are our brethren because like us they have been made sons of God through Him.

A second and equally formidable obstacle stands in the way of an understanding friendship between Anglicans and Roman Catholics in this country. It lies in our past history. No candid student of the Reformation can view the evolution of events during that period of chaos without a feeling of profound sorrow for the sins and lost opportunities of the past. Europe was surging with new ideas and new life, the waves of which swept to meet the solid land of traditional Christendom; a land once fertile but now so hard and dry as to resist, until too late, the forming on its surface of inlets and channels to carry off the flood, and irrigate its parched and withered vegetation.

The new ideas came when the Church was ill prepared to receive and assimilate them. The Papacy, weakened in men's eyes by the long scandal of the Babylonish captivity and the great schism, was so occupied with diplomacy and intrigue that it was in danger of being regarded more as one of the rival powers of Europe than as the spiritual centre of Christendom. The Popes themselves, sometimes

THE APPROACH TO REUNION

chosen with an eye to their capacity for political rather than for spiritual rule, were not the leaders who could or would initiate a drastic reform in head and members. There was widespread scandal and corruption in the highest ecclesiastical places, and men began to ask themselves whether an authority which tolerated and sometimes actively exploited perversions of truth and justice so gross could indeed be of God. Meanwhile, the intellectual life of the Church was at a low ebb, and what was worse, true spirituality had declined, giving place to a formalism which emphasized external works at the expense of interior sanctification and was content to allow men's souls to starve through being unfed by the Body and Blood of Christ in Holy Communion.

Was it much wonder that the wave of new ideas finding its progress blocked and no sufficient channels in which to flow swelled to a great flood, tearing up and destroying as it went? At the back of the reforming movement lay much that was sound and good. Apart from the desire for the abolition of the more obvious abuses connected with simony and other forms of spiritual traffic, and certain undoubted superstitions, anxiety was shown for a more real sharing by the laity in the life of grace. This expressed itself in the wish for the restoration of frequent Communion, for liturgical reform, and for re-emphasis on congregational worship, but a sense of impotence in the face of entrenched abuses drove people into the position of rebels against authority, and, the momentum of their minds gathering speed, they ended by becoming destroyers rather than renovators of the riches of Catholic truth.

Out of the chaos of conflicting movements emerged the Church of England, strongly national in sentiment, closely bound up with the State, altered almost beyond recognition, though preserving some elements of its pre-reformation past; but now no longer a component part of a united Christendom, but a new and independent entity. It was a dominant and persecuting body, or at least a body so closely identified with the persecuting State that the functions of the two were scarcely distinguishable (I am stating

facts, not discussing values); and the fullest force of its repressive zeal fell upon the little group who still remained actively faithful in their allegiance to the Holy See. For two hundred and fifty years this little group was a harried, repressed, and dwindling minority which kept the faith with heroic fortitude, cut off from any part in the education and the rich cultural life that was flourishing around them. From that group the Roman Catholic Church in England to-day is descended, and we are only now beginning to recover from the famine of the lean years of persecution; but as a body we are saturated with the glorious traditions of our Catholic forefathers and of our martyrs who suffered death for the Faith.

But these traditions of the past, glorious in themselves, undoubtedly do blind us to the fact that the disasters of the Reformation were due, largely at any rate, to worldliness and neglect of duty in high quarters, to supine toleration of abuse and corruption and to acquiescence on the part of authority in a very low standard of spirituality; to the sins in short of Catholics themselves. We sometimes adopt an attitude of arrogance as if the fault were all on the other side, whereas we should be the first to confess our share of the blame for the divisions and woes of Christendom. At the same time, Anglicans must exercise a wide charity, remembering that the memory of centuries of persecution is not easily blotted out. We stand on the threshold of a new and changing world, and we must look steadily forward to the unity of the future, not backward to the divisions and bitterness of the past; if we do this the obstacles from our past history which stand in the way of mutual understanding will gradually melt away.

A third obstacle to understanding friendship is what is generally called Rome's exclusiveness. Let me quote once again the words of Fr. Hebert.⁴ 'The Roman Church is catholic in the richness of her spiritual treasures in a liturgical, devotional and theological tradition which sums up the life of the Christian centuries; the note of universality

⁴ *Op. cit.*, Ch. vii, pp. 96-97.

is writ large over her thought and her life. Yet in her exclusive claim to be Catholic she is not Catholic but the most denominational of all denominations in so far as the claim of the infallible authority of the Pope is used as an instrument of exclusiveness in order to prove all other Christians to be in the wrong.' And again, 'Catholicity in the true sense belongs to the Holy Spirit; and it is impossible to accept the Roman claim in the form in which it is commonly presented by its apologists in England without denying the reality of the work of the Holy Spirit in the rest of Christendom.'

The Roman claim must necessarily be fundamentally the same in whatever country it is put forward; if its method of presentation differs in England from its method of presentation elsewhere the difference is not one of principle, but of the application of a principle. I have tried to show earlier in this paper that no Roman Catholic can safely deny the reality of the work of the Holy Spirit in the rest of Christendom except by asserting that all Christians outside the obedience of Rome are in a state of mortal sin.

Let me, however, set in contrast to this charge against the Church of Rome of a special exclusiveness some words of another Anglican, Dr. Parsons, the Bishop of Southwark. I quote from the *Church Times*.⁵ The Bishop was speaking to a group of Baptists on the subject of reunion between Anglicans and Nonconformists.

'What their forefathers believed to be really important principles,' he said, 'led them to break away from the communion and fellowship of the Church of England; our forefathers could not accept those principles, neither can we, and so we remain divided. There is a state of schism between us.'

Dr. Parsons then went on to explain what Anglicans have in mind when they talk of reunion.

'By reunion we Anglicans mean something very much more difficult to attain than a mutual recognition and acceptance by various denominations of each other's varying beliefs, ordin-

⁵ October 5th, 1934.

ances, ministries and ways of worship, as sufficient. We believe in one Body as well as one Spirit, our consciences can be satisfied with nothing less than the bringing together into one communion and fellowship, constituted by common standards of faith, common sacraments, and a common ministry, as a unity, corporate, organic, and visible, in which each part depends on the whole, all those denominations now organised independently of each other. But independency is one of the basic principles which distinguish the group of denominations to which you Baptists belong, and so long as it remains so your ideal of Christian unity must remain fundamentally different from ours.'

It would, I think, be hard to say better what the Bishop has said here. Substitute the words *Church of Rome* for *Church of England*, and *Church of England* for *Baptist denomination*, and the words *independence of Rome* for *independency*, and the principles of unity he lays down ■ between the Church of England and the Baptists exactly fit the situation as between the Church of Rome and the Church of England. Dr. Parsons goes on to say:

' the Church of England believes that the authority of its ministry to teach and guide and rule is derived from that which Our Saviour committed to His apostles. This derivation depends partly on the inward conviction of all who are admitted to ■ share in that ministry that they are truly called to it by the Holy Ghost; partly on a commission given by those who have received authority to ordain. As a matter of historical fact, I believe that the institution through which that authority has been maintained from the first days until now is the episcopate. You Baptists have deliberately and conscientiously rejected episcopacy. The historic episcopate has often been grievously misused and misrepresented by unworthy bishops, but that does not alter the fact that it has always safeguarded the principle of the corporate solidity of the Church as ■ whole.

Again substitute *Roman Catholic Church* for *Church of England* and *Anglican* for *Baptist* and the phrase *episcopate in communion with the See of Rome* for *episcopate* and the words of Dr. Parsons exactly describe the Roman Catholic attitude towards reunion; save that we should not make the authority of the episcopate immediately dependent on the inward conviction of a call by the Holy Ghost. The truth is that Rome is no more exclusive than Canterbury.

THE APPROACH TO REUNION

Any Christian body which holds firmly that certain dogmas and institutions are fundamental to Christianity ■ being part of our Lord's will must necessarily be exclusive with regard to other Christian bodies which have lost those dogmas and institutions or treat them as unessential. Exclusiveness in this sense, and it is the only sense in which a spirit of exclusiveness is legitimate, is not incompatible with charity, but is an expression of it; for the highest expression of charity is to do the Will of God. The fact that a doctrine of the unity and authority of the Church excludes greater *numbers* from the unity of the visible Church does not really make a Church which holds that doctrine more essentially exclusive. When this truth is fully and frankly recognized by both sides the obstacle to an understanding friendship which comes from the accusation of exclusiveness will disappear.

May I end with a suggestion? I should like to see growing up at a number of centres all over England small informal groups of Anglicans and Roman Catholics meeting together to discuss the problem of reunion, not in a spirit of controversy, but in a spirit of frank and free statement of conviction such as characterized the Malines conversations. Roman Catholics and Anglicans would then begin to be drawn together, not simply as people who get on well in social intercourse, but as friends who understand and can realize with sympathy each other's deepest convictions. Such friendship would generate an intense desire for reunion, and when this desire germinates and grows surely the powerful working of the Holy Ghost will find in it material upon which he can operate, and reunion will become an accomplished fact. To me the deep and loving friendship between two saintly men—Cardinal Mercier and Lord Halifax—is the type of a friendship which ought to exist between Roman Catholics in this country and members of the Church of England. When that friendship does become actual the day will not be far off when the Church of England will be not absorbed by, but gathered into (you must allow me to end on a controversial note) the unity of the visible Church.

HENRY ST JOHN, O.P.

CATHOLICISM AND PROTESTANTISM IN THE MODERN WORLD¹

IN the course of history the relation of Catholicism and Protestantism undergoes, as it were, physiognomical transformations, which, while they do not affect the inmost dogmatic division, strike deep enough to impress on these two systems new and unforeseeable characteristics in different times and places. The essential division in belief, as a theological phenomenon, remains just what it is; and in view of this, it is impossible—even for men of good will—to explain it away or compromise on it. This undebatable and irreducible phenomenon can only be effaced by unity in the Faith. We do not wish primarily to treat of the relation of Catholicism and Protestantism from this purely theological aspect of dogmatic difference and reunion, although even our present consideration can only be read under this explicit proviso, and in view of this final and deepest problem. For if Catholicism and Protestantism are from one point of view and in modern history simply two great historical forces, we cannot on that account act as though the problem belonged only to the sphere of historical research into cultural spirituality. Beyond the scope of history there is an enquiry of theological import.

¹ We are indebted to the author and to the editor of *Der Katholische Gedanke* (the quarterly review of the German Catholic *Akademikerverband*) for permission to publish this article which appeared in that review under the title *Das Verhältnis vom Katholizismus und Protestantismus in der Gegenwart*. Dr. Bauhofer of the University of Fribourg, Switzerland, is a distinguished writer on theological and philosophical subjects, whose chief work, *Das Metareligiöse*, on the Philosophy of Religion, written while yet a Protestant, is shortly to appear in an English translation. Latterly he has published several articles on various aspects of the inter-relation of Catholicism and Protestantism and on the question of reunion in *Der Katholische Gedanke* and *Schweizerische Rundschau*.

We take as our starting point the fact that Catholicism and Protestantism appear on the stage of history as two forces, each of which presents a whole system of human cultural values, and so an entire totality of life. Ultimately, in the theological field, Catholicism and Protestantism are incommensurable—though even here some qualification is required. But as formative powers of history, as complete forms and formulas of historical existence, Catholicism and Protestantism are *fundamentally commensurable*. On this plane, then, we find a series of problems which is *common* to both. Even their very opposition continually creates a common point of contact for their opposing principles. We find, on this plane, a *relation* between Catholicism and Protestantism which has proved historically to be manageable and valuable, and which at the present time is well defined—a relation sometimes of enmity, sometimes of cold indifference, sometimes of an inner human nearness and readiness to understand. The ‘relation’ of Catholicism and Protestantism has then its own history and, moreover, its own ethos. It is not our purpose to show the history of this relation and the variations of this ethos, even in its general outlines. We have drawn attention to the fact solely to prepare the ground for the consideration of the problem which concerns us: the relation between Catholicism and Protestantism at the present time.

Catholicism and Protestantism now stand in one and the same historical compartment. No longer, as in the Middle Ages, does Catholicism stand in uncontested totality and exclusiveness; no longer, as in the first hundred years of the Renaissance and at the time of the early Counter-reformation, do Catholicism and Protestantism possess, in rigid territorial separation, their closed provinces of independent activity, which a final form of pure Catholic culture, the Baroque culture, had made possible. The first breach in the walls which separated Catholicism and Protestantism from each other, spiritually and socially, was made by the *Aufklärung*; an epoch which, if inglorious in some respects, was immensely important in the development of the history of Western Europe. Through its on-

slaught on all positive expressions of revealed Christianity, and its comparative criticism of the different Christian confessions according to a common standard—a process bringing help and advancement to the Catholic and the Protestant side alike—the *Aufklärung* produced for the first time a kind of spiritual freedom of intercourse between Catholicism and Protestantism. The French Revolution with its direct and indirect effects throughout Europe, was the signal for the dissolution of the territorial and social barriers between Catholicism and Protestantism. The German classical period bears witness to the existence of the new intellectual and social sphere, the *one* sphere which has taken the place of two. The German classics, it is true, grew up almost without exception on a non-Catholic soil, but they cannot be regarded as a typical and representative accomplishment of Protestant thought. In the Romantic period this new intellectual sphere is perfected, and bears internal witness to the fact inasmuch as the Romantic movement is carried on alike by Catholics and Protestants, and some of its leading personalities were even converted to Catholicism; though one could never say on that account that Romanticism was a Catholic phenomenon, as Baroque had been. One may here remember that the first third of the nineteenth century also brought the emancipation of Catholics in England, whereby in the heart of the Anglo-Saxon world there was begun at this other centre of European Protestantism a reciprocal penetration of the two spheres of Catholicism and Protestantism that was to be all-important in the future.

These facts are of minor significance. But they suffice to set before our eyes what is an indubitable event in our intellectual history: that Catholics and Protestants for a century and a half have lived together, intellectually and socially, in the same sphere, a sphere which is neither Catholic nor Protestant, nor yet just undenominational; but rather a single field of force in which the various efforts, Catholic and Protestant, Christian and secular, meet and penetrate each other in a single synthesis, both by mutual

co-operation and mutual opposition. For the study of the forms of the relation between Catholicism and Protestantism this means that we have got clean away from the period of the 'Counter-reformation,' in which culturally and sociologically Catholicism and Protestantism had existed independently each in its own closed compartment. This period of intellectual, political and cultural separation of Catholicism and Protestantism, in brief the period of the Counter-reformation, is finally over. The two compartments—this is an incontrovertible historical fact—have grown together into one. The classic confessional controversy of the early Counter-reformation was carried on on both sides, not merely as a struggle with religious heterodoxy, but as a defence against a whole way of life that went with it. In other words, the confessional polemic had an immediate and far-reaching *political* importance: in deciding between Catholicism and Protestantism men decided not only for this or that creed or form of public worship, but also for this or that political organization, these or those social principles and so forth. There was involved in this decision not only the soul's salvation and one or another form of personal life (and perhaps above and beyond that, this or that theory and ideal plan of the design of the universe), but also the real formation of all public interests. *We* can regard these once actual decisions only as matters of past history, attributing a wholly altered significance to such decisions, and assessing the animosities and harshnesses of the struggle only as things of the past.

The problem which faces us at the present time is a different one. Socially we are set no more among the symptoms of the Counter-reformation, and so our modernity forgets without hesitation the necessity and significance of that kind of intellectual opposition which was the peculiar nature of the social structure of that time. The relation between Catholicism and Protestantism will not to-day, at least in the sphere of European culture, be burdened and prejudiced by the necessity of the struggle against the menace of secularization of Church property on the one

hand, or the terror of the Inquisition on the other. The relation between Catholicism and Protestantism stands at present beyond the sphere of political relevance, that is, beyond an opposition of interests which has its repercussions in public politics. But the whole relation is thus transferred into quite a new sphere, at once more spiritual and more human. With this statement, disregarding degrees of comparison, I would like to make this absolute judgment: the necessities, both factual and moral, of the present position are other than under the signature of the Counter-reformation.

This new situation has brought with it its own illusions. The most obvious indeed, and moreover the grossest form of illusion, is usually only just touched upon in passing, and then compromised with; it consists, not unnaturally, in the simple fact that people have not realized that we have left behind the time of the Counter-reformation. To-day the legendary figures of the Grand Inquisitor and the Protestant robber of churches and iconoclast are no longer to the fore. However just such recriminations may have been in a more or less remote past, there is absolutely no sense in using them as arguments in the situation as it is to-day. In an historical position in which such an attitude seems no longer even remotely justified, persistence in this mentality will bring itself into complete disgrace. We are accustomed to treat such an attitude as *kulturkämpferisch*, thus expanding an historical catchword into an objective category. It is clear that the *kulturkämpferisch* type has existed even among Catholics. But this attitude is always a grotesque self-contradiction; for the 'opponent' too will here be misunderstood only for the wrong reason, namely because the whole situation has been misunderstood and misconceived.

A more subtle, and so in some respects also a more hazardous and dangerous illusion, consists in the fact that people misconceive this 'more spiritual and more human' relation of Catholicism and Protestantism at the present day, and identify it with the settlement of the essential *theological* difference between the two. The danger is that

one may think the peculiar character of the present relation, namely inner human nearness and possibility of understanding, is the same as the solution of that quite different theological problem of the division in belief; or in other words that one may mistake the outer, phenomenal problems for those proper to theology. To those who confuse these two issues it will seem an anachronism, as well as a moral blunder, to talk of dogmatic divisions, which appear to prevent the finish of a useless and too long drawn out conflict. I do not mean to describe more closely here the different forms in which this view finds expression, and which have recently re-appeared in the idea of a 'German national church.' But even in the sphere of church history proper this ideology has found some degree of realization, that is to say, its realization has been sought, and to-day it must be considered to have failed—and to have failed of necessity. I am thinking, as is easy to guess, of the so-called 'oecumenical' movement.

The work of Christian reunion, as it presented itself to the mind of the fascinating but untheological Söderblom, was to reunite 'Pauline' (Protestant), 'Johannine' (Orthodox), and 'Petrine' (Catholic) Christianity in a new synthesis. It seemed to Söderblom that we had outgrown the time for dogmatic reunion, and what he considered the specifically Roman Catholic method of absorption (absorption of the other churches into the Papal church) appeared to him un-Christian. We see here (what is quite typical of that denial) the human intellectual nearness in which, in the single sphere of life as it is now, the different Christian denominations have met, confused with the vital theological problem of the division of belief and its possible conquest. Even for a Protestant audience Rome's inability to co-operate here, hardly needs an apology, but for a decade in that fair oecumenical springtime it was inevitably bound to be misunderstood and misrepresented. Yet—I may here add this, though it is no longer of strict relevance—the oecumenical movement has not perished from the crisis that broke out from within (the crisis of its ideology); it has, unnoticed by the public and perhaps in the course of

events not immediately understood even by many interested parties, changed radically, undertaking quite a new line of more simple matter of fact theological work which is not corrupted in advance by an untenable ideology. The oecumenical movement in its original conception and its first phase, now past and done with—the phase of the great pan-Christian conferences and ‘delegations’—is the most typical example of the coercion of the theological realities of belief, confession, and Church to an untheologically conceived ideology of unity. That quest was bound to fail, not because it was premature, but because it is altogether impossible to realize it in this form.

That is a relevant fact, not only with reference to the relation of Catholicism and Protestantism, but quite as much—as has become clear to-day—with reference to the different denominations of Protestantism in their own mutual relations. The moderate, well-defined confessional denominations of Protestant-Evangelical Christianity (Lutheranism, Calvinism and Anglicanism, to name only the most important types) are, it is true, internally reformable (this fact is posed differently for the different types, and is in no case perfectly clear and admissible of an unequivocal answer), but if they are capable of being revised, then they are more than the documentary records of an antiquated spirituality, and of a problem which has to-day lost its meaning. If believing Protestantism in Germany to-day reaffirms its old confessions, and this only in virtue of bonds of blood, then we reject it; if rather in bonds of the spirit, we admit it; if in bonds of the Holy Spirit, then, in accordance with the deepest nature of Catholic principles of faith, we can only yield it an unqualified assent. Believing Protestantism will not allow its historic confessions of faith to be reft from it. For us Catholics this faithfulness to confession is not only humanly venerable; those confessions have also the power to awaken in us a feeling of reverence, provided that we understand their modern function as the substance of a positive evangelical Christianity, and not, according to their significance in the past, as the signs of schism from the Catholic Church. And

if God will bring out of them a people whose hour we know not, to whom it will be granted to carry out the reuniting of belief, then we can be certain that this event will be brought about by means of, not over the heads of, denominational beliefs. The historic confessional formularies of the different Protestant denominations are not merely (in the view of Catholics) the chief cause of the schism, they are also the last, the only bulwark of positive Christianity within the Protestant world. If these bulwarks were to fall, not because their temporary but necessary function is given back to the mother Church, but because they are abandoned, thrown over and given up, then would the Reformation have ended horribly and as a caricature of itself. The reformed confessions keep Protestantism outside the Catholic Church, but they also keep it fast within the doors of the Church. Paradoxical though it may sound, the reformed confessions, instruments of the schism, are also pledges for the anticipation of eventual reunion.

But will not this return to the old estimate of the reformed confessions as the foundations of evangelical Christianity in the wide sphere of modern Protestantism, permit also in the relation of Catholicism and Protestantism, the introduction of new tensions, or rather the revival of old ones, so that we Catholics can regard that new consciousness, in itself a matter for rejoicing, only, so to speak, with mixed feelings? Will not on that account the 'confessional peace' to which we have found our way laboriously on both sides by good will, be exposed to new infections and new dangers? Certainly the question is not in itself unwarrantable, but we can in no case identify ourselves with the cares which give expression to it. The sincere love of truth must take first place. We Catholics must prefer to be classed as members of the Church of Antichrist by the serious mind and incorruptible good sense of such a theologian as Karl Barth than that Ernst Bergmann should tolerate, and in tolerating domesticate, Catholic priests and some secondary and relatively unimportant accessories of Catholicism in his 'German national church.'

We can bear it quietly and calmly, yes, we shall gladly grow accustomed to it once more, if Protestantism yet again finds its full reaffirmation in opposition to our Church, provided only that this expression makes explicit the true religious and theological causes behind the Reformation, and does not mean anything at all *kulturkämpferisch*. Truth will be better served if we stand opposed face to face, with between us the pure, inexpugnable, inexorable problems of the theological issue. The possibility of somehow overcoming once for all the distances that divide us is greater if the distances are clearly thought out, the divisions clearly estimated and considered.

The 'confessional peace' is a secular institution, as the confession itself is a secular institution. The Church belongs to the theological, the denomination to the secular order. Confessional peace is nothing else than the expression of the fact that to-day the different Christian communions no longer have command each over a single social sphere, but live together in one common sphere, which is also the sphere of the modern secular community, and of the modern democratic, and for the most part non-religious State. The churches are no longer solid expressions of social, domestic, and political systems, which they are concerned to assure and defend together with what is their confession for the time being. The different communities of belief, then, live side by side to-day in a 'confessional peace' which is the peace of secular community. Confessional peace, this 'secular peace between the denominations' is a real good, but a good only of the secular order. It will, therefore, continue unchanged in every way so long as it is only a question of this good within the secular order, and so within the limits of its own character. But it is impossible for any purely theological discussion about affairs of dogma and church to be settled under the pretext of preserving the confessional peace. The good of truth belongs to a higher order than does confessional peace, and it would doubtless be a most dangerous undertaking, as well as a gross misunderstanding, if one was to build up on an alleged absolute and unconditional precept

of peace inside and between the churches, the obligation to maintain a precinct closed to theology. In questions of truth there can be no closed precincts.

In other words, the confessional peace is to continue, and to remain what it is, *viz.*, the mutual contentment of the confessions within a secular sphere—but *theology must be kept separate from secular considerations*. Theology, for us in this context the question of *truth*, has to take itself apart from the spirit of this secular sphere. In the search for truth there are landmarks and boundary stones, and we may not like to be reminded of it. Perhaps this is already quite different nowadays, and it is well so. The secular sphere has become for us of to-day a problematic magnitude; we can to some extent trace its genesis to the great western process of secularization, and thereby we have put a measure to it which for a previous generation was lacking. Thus there has been rewon a freedom for the things of the spirit, which is not to be confused with the liberal maxim, 'Thought is free,' but which means on the contrary that we once more safely set up in the kingdom of truth the boundary stones and landmarks without which the idea, the *summum bonum* of truth, to which every Christian community is bound, evaporates and becomes a mere liberal catchword. So too no secular authority—it might here be a question of the English Parliament in the decline of the Anglican Church, or of similar relationships in other countries and churches where the State authority can to a certain extent assert a legal claim, founded in the beginnings of the Reformation, to have a say in the settlement of church affairs,—I say that for that reason no secular authority can take away from or deprive the Christian communities of the sole responsibility in questions pertaining to matters of church or theology.

Questions of this kind cannot be bargained over. This is a principle which holds for every single Christian denomination in its relation to the State authority. And the central theological problems, (we do not want to call them points of dispute), cannot be artificially limited, a principle which holds for the different Christian denomina-

tions in their mutual relations, and so above all for the relation between Catholicism and Protestantism. The fact of differences of belief as we have said, cannot and must not be covered up and trifled with, through the two sides never accustoming themselves to live as peaceful neighbours in a secular sphere of existence. That does not mean that we want to concentrate on breeding an everlasting succession of intrigues. It does not mean 'that we cannot and will not accommodate ourselves to historical matters of fact.' It means just this, that there is here no safe agreement possible. If we speak of the difference of belief we mean that it is a thorn in the flesh of the peoples of the West, but one whose existence cannot be ignored. But the one *historical* fact which demands unqualified recognition from us, Catholics and Protestants alike, is that Catholicism and Protestantism no longer each have control over one single sphere of existence, and that in the common sphere in which both are bound together by the evolution of history there is neither any definite nor indefinite possibility of their contesting each other's right to exist or to develop fully their own religious life.

And on these lines we can now go a step further. Catholicism and Protestantism are now neighbours in the same common sphere of which we have spoken so much, the secular world. In this secular sphere the right of the two great types of confession, Catholicism and Protestantism, to live and develop in fundamental opposition cannot be contested. We have shown the reason why. This indisputability of development of religious and church life demanded for Catholicism and Protestantism and mutually preserved by them, involves no glossing over the division in belief, which was indeed only thought possible for reasons of secular convenience. The theological questions at issue between them remain for ever explicitly reserved; they cannot, as was said, be artificially limited.

But there is another possibility, and one required by the present historical situation to which we are all without exception tied. *Catholicism and Protestantism stand in this sphere of the secular world as the representatives of the*

Christian tradition and the Christian way of life. It is impossible and unthinkable that in the present condition of the world the two great confessional communities should not mutually recognize *this* dignity and this function, of being both of them the guardians and preservers of the Christian inheritance among our peoples and in our countries. In truth Protestants and Catholics here shoulder a common responsibility. This responsibility is laid on them by God. We must bow before the fact that the 'Christian front' is a divided front, and to change it is not to be left to the decision of a day or the power of mere good will. On the contrary, the immediate demand that we should be a wall of defence for the Christian inheritance admits of no delay.

Protestantism itself, indeed, on account of its own original dialectic, is at all times most strongly menaced by the impress of 'the world,' of secularism. The sharp antithesis between nature and grace in the theology of the reformers deprives every search for the true system of reality of any secure foundations and any unalterable standard. It allows no genuine system of natural rights. And even in the specifically theological field, the principles of the reformers fail to provide for the possibility and necessity of the penetration of the world by the supernatural; although at this point Anglican-Catholic tradition, revived during the last hundred years, cuts itself off from the genuine theology of the Reformation. Cast in a paradoxical form the theology of the reformers has the Cross, but lacks the Incarnation. And in proportion as this world is not ordered to things Christian, there is a danger that it will break in with disordered violence, and that its supremacy will be simply acknowledged. We do not say that such is the case, since we wish to give the critics the last word. Even Catholicism has piled up fault on fault in those forecourts of the sanctuary which are not defended by the special assistance of God, and has presented to the world the spectacle of human weakness and folly. We know better perhaps to-day about *mea maxima culpa* in these matters.

But on this very fact that we, Protestants and Catholics, are meeting to-day with a dread time of judgment, and thus experience a terrible measure of the guilt that is ours, is based the promise and expectation of this hour. The consciousness which is awakened by God himself, into which we are led by the time of judgment, is in reality a heaven-sent quest for home: a quest for home started not only by the time of judgement, but by grace. This is the hour of purification. In the refining fire we grow or we are extirpated. In that hour to him that hath shall be given; but from him that hath not, that also which he seemeth to have shall be taken away (Matth. 25, 29). But growth is the work of *grace*: it is grace which grows in us. And on that is based a hope which *humanly speaking* is not only quite unlikely to be fulfilled, but also quite unimaginable and nonsensical, but which has everything in its favour, since, as the Apostle assures us, nothing can withstand God: the hope that through the mystical power of the purification, Protestantism and Catholicism will grow together in every way more closely and more deeply—will grow together not so much on a level, side by side, but in obedience to the operation of a mysterious mighty power, in the direction of their centre, Jesus Christ. Then—and with this we add our last point, of which we have not been able to make special mention hitherto, but which has none the less been ever present to us, and is not invalidated in its supernatural validity by our divisions in belief: Protestants and Catholics are for ever bound together in God's sight by the sacramental sign of Holy Baptism. By the power of this holy sign, both they and we are set in the reality of the Body of Christ.

OSKAR BAUHOFFER.

(Translated by H. C. Thomas)

AFTER FOUR HUNDRED YEARS

IT is a characteristic feature of this time of transition in which we are living that the subject of Christian Unity is being discussed almost universally. Catholic and non-Catholic can write of it and proffer suggestions without arousing too serious an outburst of protest. For Methodists and Presbyterians the matter has passed from the stage of discussion to the goal of accomplished fact. Anglicanism with an eye to the future rather than the past is entering a new phase of comprehensiveness by proclaiming itself as a bridge providentially built to span the gulf between Catholicism and Protestantism. Of necessity Catholics remain materially unaffected by the movement, conscious as they are of the complete Unity of the Church in which they are visibly incorporate; nevertheless there remains a wide margin where we can express our views and opinions with regard to Christian Unity and the means of attaining it. Many of us take our views ready-made upon this subject from the Catholic Press, and save ourselves the trouble of thinking any further about it. It is so splendid to be told that we Catholics, standing secure behind the battlements, can look down with happy serenity upon the struggling disorder of warring sects below. If the warring sects cease to struggle, and achieve a formula of unity, what is our reaction? The 'battlement feeling' makes us perhaps uneasy because the non-Catholic bodies are not quite playing the game: they should be continuing the struggle, so that we could happily continue to draw the moral! If we are to form a reasoned and approachable attitude of mind towards the urgent problem of Union, we must eschew the slightest trace of patronage and condescension towards our non-Catholic neighbour, and shun our splendid isolation, as well as withhold our righteous anger when he seems to hurt us: we find ourselves compelled once again to remonstrate a little too often to establish that atmosphere of tranquillity, which is the proper preliminary for friendly discussion.

Without any sacrifice of theological principle or risk of compromise, we can approach the question of Unity with all the sweet reasonableness and delicacy which is to be found in *Après quatre cents ans*,¹ an outstanding book which bears upon the problem, as it is set between Catholic and Calvinistic Protestant in French Switzerland. Its author is His Excellency Mgr. Besson, the Bishop of Lausanne, Geneva and Fribourg.

The book is cast in the form of correspondence between the Abbé Favre, Curé of a village in Canton Vaud, and M. Curchod, the Protestant Pastor. Letters to and from others are incorporated, as the need arises, to expose Catholic doctrine or views upon particular problems or practices. Both Curé and Pastor who share the spiritual ministrations of the village are men of common-sense who sincerely deplore the misunderstanding and separation that divides Catholic from Protestant, so they decide in a friendly and unofficial way to discuss their differences. They are already united in a strong bond of local patriotism as fellow-Vaudois, and with that as a basis they exchange their views with perfect frankness and courtesy. In the Curé's own words: 'Suppose we tried to understand one another, to mark out our respective positions, to fix the points . . . on which we agree, to distinguish the essential from the incidental? Suppose we set out above all to prepare an atmosphere of sympathy and of mutual good will where the *rapprochement* which both of us wish for would be less difficult to attain. When I pushed open the door to go out—the little door beside the sacristy—the sky was filled with stars. A distant bell struck the hour: another replied. The crickets were singing. I forgot to turn the key: I noticed it this morning. Perhaps my special vocation is to open the church, not to close it.'

In Pastor Curchod's reply are these words: 'We are standing on two banks separated by a large ditch, which

¹ *Après quatre cents ans*. M. Besson. (Genève, Librairie Jacquemoud, Corraterie, 20. 9^{me} mille, 4^{me} édition.) The book is excellently produced, the type is pleasing to read, and the many woodcuts of Vaudois churches are finely executed.

many unwittingly take pleasure in deepening day by day. Instead of continuing this work of destruction we must first of all fill up the unhappy gulf. Afterwards, we should still remain separated, but only by the distance between us: a flat surface is easier to cross than a ravine.'

Before long, the Curé's patience is tried by the Comtesse de Villebrune, who represents a class known in France as *catholiques enragés*! She writes: 'Each time we return to Switzerland we are more surprised, I do not hide the fact, at this mixture of religions in the midst of which you and your compatriots seem to feel at your ease. How is it that you do nothing about converting all these Protestants? My sister-in-law who is *dans les oeuvres* asks me to tell you that, if you wish, she will send you a stock of pamphlets which point out clearly the weakness of Protestantism and the vices of the Reformers.' The Comtesse deplures the theft of Lausanne Cathedral by the Protestants: 'When will they restore it to the Catholics? I am astonished that you do not lay claim to it with more energy. In your case there are compromises which I, a true-blue royalist, cannot agree to.' The Curé's reply is perfectly courteous, but he denies the theft of 'our Cathedral' by the Protestants: 'If the people of Vaud had remained Catholic, the Cathedral would still be Catholic; since they passed over to the Reformed religion, the Cathedral became Protestant. The reason is that our ancestors, who were ill prepared, did not react with sufficient force to repel the new ideas which were thrust upon them. The clergy, too indifferent and too pre-occupied with their personal comfort, could not recognize the gravity of the danger. The Bishop himself instead of remaining at his post to defend the souls under his charge, bolted!'

As to the pamphlets: 'Publications of this kind seem to me to be useless and often dangerous. Their authors, who are ill informed, lack understanding. The way they speak of what they take to be Protestantism reminds me of the tracts of some of the evangelical *colporteurs* wherein you read that we adore the Blessed Virgin or that the Pope is Anti-Christ. Objectively, perhaps, each is not equally valid,

but in each case the result is the same. Six of one and half-a-dozen of t'other!

We all wish for the return to religious unity, but we must use other means of finding it. To say "We have the truth, others are mistaken: therefore it is sufficient to make the truth known, in order to get those who are mistaken to open their eyes to it immediately" is simply childish. Doubtless we must speak out, especially when we are in the presence of good folk who have a mistaken idea of Catholicism; but controversy, even of the most solid kind, is not always seasonable. As to sharp and ill-natured polemic, it has never produced any good whatsoever.'

Point by point, Catholic doctrine is reviewed and presented with straightforward simplicity and no trace of talking down to the non-Catholic. Re-union, by the methods of the Lausanne Conference, is fully discussed, and the Catholic reasons for disagreement and non-participation made quite clear. The Curé, too, shows a surprisingly exact knowledge of Anglicanism and its different schools of thought.

A student at the Seminary receives this sound advice: 'If you wish to contribute to the salvation of the world, you must know what the world is, and therefore take an interest in it. May your horizon never be limited by a sacristy wall or a chapel belfry. If we are attached to ecclesiastical questions alone, if we remain insensible to what preoccupies our contemporaries in the economic and social order, if we abstract ourselves from the contingencies in the midst of which God has called us to live, we shall end by I know not what ill-conditioned, pretentious and exasperating kind of clericalism! . . . What harm the complete separation of spiritual and temporal has done in Catholic countries! . . . You will prepare yourself, not by practising polemics (it is rarely of use), but in steeping yourself in the spirit of the Gospel: it is on the Gospel that our fathers separated; it is by the Gospel that we shall be united.'

Converts enter into the correspondence—the Curé has only received about half a dozen—simply to show that in one case the Protestant parents live in tranquillity with

their Catholic son, once they discover that he remains a normal and decent member of the household, with a keener sense of his duties to father and mother.

The Curé is at his ablest in writing to a fellow-priest upon the Reformation: there is here a frank admission of Catholic shortcomings and a respect for Protestant sincerity. 'The official accounts of the pastoral visitations carried out in the diocese some decades of years before paint a very gloomy picture of the situation: we have no difficulty in admitting it, for there is no humiliation in telling the truth as you see it. At that period religious life here was certainly not what it should have been . . . don't let us try and justify everything . . . let us put on one side the childish descriptions which certain of our adversaries have given of the times preceding the Reformation, blackening the picture as they please: but let us recognize too quite loyally the unhappy religious state of our country at the gloomy hour when unity was broken.' The Curé would be happy in reading the Abbé Constant's work on the Reformation.

There are strong words for what is called *toute une végétation de dévotionnettes*, 'of which no one is indispensable and several are, to say the least of it, puerile . . . In *milieux* where Catholicism is unknown, many good souls who misunderstand these devotions are scandalized at them, and are consequently estranged when they would like to approach us.'

The good Curé prevents an angry reply to an anti-Catholic article which he calls *parfaitement idiot* . . . 'Let us not react every time . . . When rights are violated, above all, rights of conscience, we must protest energetically: but in this case we are only dealing with malicious trifles . . . How many times do we not have to regret that second-rate Catholic journals, above all in certain countries, have no idea how to abstain from disagreeable words and from commentaries utterly lacking in good feeling towards Protestants! If we were without sin in this domain as in many others we could the more freely cast the stone at our neigh-

bours.' Shadows of walled-up religious in twentieth century Spain! But in this country comment is needless.

In a letter to a nun there is the same insistence upon unity as an ideal to be worked and prayed for: 'the return to unity is not a purely human work, we must beg the divine mercy for it. I would like you to ask Him for it, associating yourself with your Sisters to obtain it, and making all your prayers and all your sacrifices a holocaust offered for this purpose. Note, Sister, I do not say, pray for the conversion of Protestants: this term gives rise to confusion . . . To be converted is to turn to God after having lived far away from Him . . . I can't believe that a bad Catholic who does not fulfil his duties would be nearer to God than a Protestant in good faith, who faithfully follows his religion. We must pray for the conversion of both, so that Catholics and Protestants alike, responding to the Inspirations of Grace, should receive, in their complete integrity, the Good Tidings of Salvation which Christ has made known to the world. All will then profess the same Doctrine, have the same Sacraments, obey the same Head, and will be animated by the same Spirit. That will be the true Unity: a single Shepherd, a single Flock.'

These quotations given at length do more to show the spirit of this magnificent book than any commentary or words of praise which would be presumptuous in view of its author's Sacred Office. The difference of locality and nation is accidental in relation to the substantial purpose of the book. Although the lines of separation are sharper and the contrast greater between Catholic and Protestant in Switzerland where local patriotism is a still healthy reality, the problem for us in England is of the same character, and the spirit of our approach to it is here for all to read and to learn. Catholics who work and pray to end the unhappy divisions of Christendom must read this book: so too must those outside the visible unity of the Church if they would receive the most sympathetic as well as the most just contribution from the Catholic side that has yet been published.

AELWIN TINDAL-ATKINSON, O.P.

ST. WANDERLUST

THE season will shortly be coming round when, in sympathy with the resurrection of life around, some ebullience in the blood moves all sorts of people to be on the wander. Some will be lacing on nailed shoes and gripping sticks to get up into the hills; some will be fitting out small boats to be away to sea; some will be throwing handbags into dickys and luggage racks, or climbing, armed with a day's rations, into charabancs. But one and all are moved by the same pleasantly impatient spirit: Wanderlust.

This brings to our mind one of the Church's 'Canonizations,' one of the triumphs of that triumphant humanism by which it admits even the life we share with the animals to partake in acts of worship which it teaches have an eternal significance. It has canonized Wanderlust by the institution of pilgrimages to shrines. He is now 'Saint Wanderlust.' He has lesser forms in the everyday desire to be up and moving, if it be only up the hill or about the town, which the Church has canonized by such institutions as processions, or the round of the Stations in Rome, or the Stations of the Cross up the hill at Pantasaph—with the view at the top. He has one supreme form in the Spring Wanderlust, which the poet noted when he said that spring was the time of pilgrimages. So he has been taught the way to shrines.

There are, of course, things much more profound that lie behind the institution of shrines than this harnessing of a mere stirring in the blood. Sometimes, as at Lourdes, they are of immediate divine institution. Sometimes even when of human institution they are the occasion of the granting of many favours, even of the working of miracles, as is apparently the case at Carfin; and hence of a great increase of devotion. Humanly instituted they are primarily a product of the practice of honouring Saints and relics and images, based on the doctrines of the Communion of Saints, the interdependent union of body and soul, and the Resurrection of the Body. Since, however, these things can be learnt equally well perhaps in our own parish churches

with their Mass, liturgy, instructions, statues and relics, we will remember some less supernatural, but nevertheless important, aspects of shrines; among which let the first be (at this time of year) that they rope in this vagrant spirit, which must take one side, on the Church's side in the battle. And for this reason:

The immense energy expended in tripping and hiking in England to-day, the hordes of people that go about looking dazedly at innumerable things and taking away with them little of permanent value to their minds, let alone their virtues, suggest that there is in England a great opportunity for Apostolate by shrines. Our Lady of Walsingham seems to have determined to show us this. Only the atmosphere of pilgrimages will have to be very different from that of trips. Something will have to be recovered of the spirit of such places as the Slipper Chapel near Walsingham, where even kings took off their shoes to approach the shrine, barefoot, over the hot white road.

When we have shrines to 'Harness Hiking and Tripping' they will help to bring other elements in our nature into the direct line of our choice of Christ. Traditionalism for instance. How often do we hear the expression: 'The religion of my fathers' used as synonymous for a thoroughly sound religion. If we can remember (and shrines can remind us) our continuity with the England of Alfred, Bede and Alcuin, Anselm, Becket and More; of Glastonbury, Fountains, and Rievaulx, of the Walsingham pilgrimage, and the Canterbury pilgrimage; of monk and Mass-priest and clerk; of Lady Day and Allhalloween and Mothering Sunday, and many another of the real things that once corresponded to our household words; then it will root our religion in the soily part of our nature—which is a part given us to use. It will also help to save England the anomaly of 'Honouring its father while dishonouring its grandfather,' which is the effect of a view of history foreshortened at the Reformation. Perhaps Mr. *Punch* was on this trail when he recently complimented the leader of a Walsingham pilgrimage.

Closely connected with this is the effect shrines might have in the production of an indigenous expression of piety. It seems desirable that the customs and imagery of devotions, to be most realized, should be most natural and homely. Shrines might help to attain this by resurrecting English Saints and devotions. In Richard Rolle, Dame Julian, and Walter Hilton we may find a piety more congenially expressed than in imagery brought from overseas, even from saints overseas. For instance, when Richard Rolle says that although many holy people kneel austere at their prayers, for his part he likes to sit, many Englishmen will recognize a fellow feeling, something almost too English to be true! This may seem a small matter, but it is not altogether without its importance; there is at least a grain of truth in the idea of an 'English Way.'

Then, again, wayside crosses, oratories and pilgrimages would break down the unnatural distinction of religious worship from ordinary life. Getting to heaven is a task too hard to divide the Sunday from the week. These things would help, too, to temper that English reserve in matters of religion which, a thing good in itself, is apt to become a mere paralysing self-consciousness. In connection with shrines often appears that pleasant expansiveness of the Saints; that mannerly demonstration with which David danced before the Ark; with which Christ stood on the Temple steps and cried, 'If any man thirst, let him come to me and drink . . . as the scripture saith out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water'; with which St. Paul boasted and with which Saints of all ages lead the many. It is well that Catholicism should come more into the public life of the people in a country where it is, at the present moment, more truly free than, perhaps, in any other in the world—Catholic countries included; and which is growing unmistakeably more friendly to it. At such places as Carfin and Walsingham, Catholics meet and discover their strength and unity, even their popularity, in some worthy devotion.

This suggests a last thought. Our responsibility in this matter grows upon us when we consider that Britain being

by nature what Catholicism is by principle—traditionalist—may well be a stronghold for Catholicism in the struggle which seems inevitable between the Church and the forces now massing against it, among which are the new assessment of moral values, Continental Masonry, Dogmatic Atheism, Communism and the other forms of the Absolute State. There is here an array of forces which has caused the Holy Father, who is not given to exaggeration, to say that the world is in a worse state than it has been since the flood. *Qui potest capere, capiat*. Under these circumstances it is comforting to remember the growing friendliness of this country towards Catholicism, and their common traditionalism. Even the appointment of an Anglican monk to a West End parish is not without its significance. But, above all: Hail! Mary of Walsingham.

FINBAR SYNNOTT, O.P.

MATERIAL THOUGHTS

There is a material side to Christianity as well as the spiritual foundation; and it is on the material side, ■ it affects our daily lives and our national interests, that my thoughts dwell at the moment. Where does Christianity touch the major problems of to-day: bad trade, unemployment, poverty, lack of general interest in public affairs, wide-spread corruption, indifference to crime and dishonesty, and finally slaughter—I might almost call it human sacrifice—on our high roads? I have no ready made cure to offer for our troubles; nor can I believe that there is a simple and easy path leading out of the complicated tangle of difficulties surrounding the individual and the nation. I am not prepared to join with those who lightly attribute all evils to the war; for it seems to me that the war, with its call for self-denial and a realization of the existence of man's duty as well as man's rights, nearly saved the nation from spiritual decadence. I do believe that there is a way out of our troubles, and that the key to all the problems is to be found in discipline.

A nation without religion is a nation without backbone; for sincere religious belief is the only form of discipline by which human nature can be trained to healthy growth. The law, to a certain extent, protects the weak man from his strong neighbour (though this does not apply to-day in the realm of finance): religion protects the weak man and the strong man alike from himself. So difficult are our personal problems; so powerful is public opinion on minor subjects relating to appearances, social status, *et hoc genus omne*, that special power is needed by man to keep him daily from thoughts and actions which, though not necessarily sin in themselves, are tainted by meanness and dishonesty. There is a saying in the Talmud to the effect that if a man commits a sin twice he will cease to regard it as evil doing. Religion is the only safeguard given to man as protection against the repetition of sin or unworthy thought and action of the kind not likely to be discovered. And the habit of tolerating what need not be disclosed has

led inevitably to the toleration of proven malfeasance. In fact the divorce of religion from our lives has left us as a nation without a moral standard.

It is considered to be bad taste, no doubt, to speak or write plainly on unpleasant topics; but some day the truth must be faced unless, as a nation, we are to go from bad to worse; so let us be frank and endure the stigma of bad taste. We are suffering to-day, in the first place, from wide-spread corruption. Great financiers gamble daily on our trade, our food supply and our credit; and they do this with money they do not possess: when they fail to win bankruptcy follows. This form of immorality is now depressing trade and keeping up the terribly high percentage of unemployment. Money remains locked up in the banks because people dare not invest in productive enterprise, for no honest industrial venture is to-day safe from the gamblers of the financial world. Trade has to bear the burden of dishonest gambling—dishonest because it is carried on by some men with other people's money, and by other men who know they cannot pay when they lose. Thus in addition to the immorality of this business of gambling with other people's securities, there is the frank dishonesty of the nature of the gamble. The crime and its consequences rouse no indignation in a public mind grown lethargic for want of the moral support of true religion; so trade languishes, and a vast army of unemployed men and women eke out a bare existence on the dole and on 'charity.' Similar gambling in food supplies places a tax on the consumer far heavier than any Government tax imposed before the repeal of the corn laws; and this gamble also is carried on with cynical disregard of honour by men willing to declare themselves bankrupt at any convenient moment, knowing full well that bankruptcy is nearly as fashionable as divorce, and equally free from stigma in public opinion. Having no faith, the public can but shrug its shoulders and submit to a tyranny of rogues. Our credit as a nation is high: our credit as traders no longer exists.

MATERIAL THOUGHTS

The slaughter of something near two hundred people a week on our highways, and the injury and crippling of many more, arouses no public feeling of horror and indignation, and yet it is largely a human sacrifice made to vanity and insolence and selfishness. Some men feel so important that they must hurry to save time which is money to them; and they hurry at the risk and too often at the cost of other people's lives. Others deliberately bully on the road, taking the attitude that they will not give way, that they will not be cautious on dangerous curves and at cross-roads. And many enjoy speed and so enjoy themselves, often with little skill, at the cost of—human sacrifice. This rank immorality is tolerated almost without protest, for without religion there can be no standard of right and wrong, and the only standard left for man may be put in the American phrase: 'what he can get away with.'

Sentiment has become as much *déclassé* as have expressions of patriotism; and yet sentiment and the genuine love of right and abhorrence of wrong doing are as deeply seated in the hearts of the people as they were fifty years ago. Proof of this is to be found in the Cinema. The favourite screen plays are nothing more or less than the old Adelphi melodrama in modern dressing: villany must be punished and right must triumph in the end. How is it, then, that a whole population has been coerced into assuming a veneer of cynicism and impiety which fits so uncomfortably on natures really homely and honest? My theory is that we are suffering as a nation from the teaching of the ignorant.

It is a curious paradox that with the spread of education there has come a diminution of learning. Scholarship finds no market. Teachers who have paddled in some of the shallower pools of biology feel that they have plumbed the depths of universal knowledge, and thenceforth strut and rant on daïs and platform and shriek in staccato sentences on the printed page. The dissecting knife has laid bare the mechanism of the human body (but not the mystery of life and death), and he who has learned to read may borrow some of the knowledge acquired by others

and give his own interpretation to so much of this as he can understand. Vanity in the possession of a certificate from a training college or of a pass degree is often a stepping stone to a platform of ignorance from which ill-conceived theories, possibly based on a few items of genuine knowledge, are thundered forth as proven science.

Unfortunately, this tendency is invading the higher mental grades. Psychology is a science with tremendous possibilities at present in the stage of extreme infancy; it can scarcely claim to have cut its first tooth. Yet dignified seats of learning, not content to regard it as a fruitful subject for research, have established Chairs for the teaching of psychology as a science. Young people go forth from these universities to put into dangerous practice theories which for them bear the hallmark of science. Even in the world of physics the accepted fact of to-day becomes a jest to-morrow; so it would seem that the study of the human mind would inspire the greatest caution in any man possessed of a sense of responsibility. But startling theories are more easily vended than dry facts, and the sense of responsibility has no market value; so it is that the teachers of the nation can leave religious thought to die of inanition while holding the public attention by the glitter of something new. Teachers armed with a smattering of learning that has not reached the status of knowledge, and an armful of theories couched in phrases which give to assertion the face value of axiom, so overvalue their mental attainments that they deny the existence of all they fail to understand. They can conceive of nothing mightier than themselves; and so the knowledge of God and of the eternal verities is lost to these blind leaders of the blind.

What makes the people shy at Christianity? Is it that the ideal set is so terrible in its perfection? It may be that religion is unpopular because the sincere Christian can never be really at peace with himself; he can never feel really self-satisfied. Christianity demands so much more than mere protestations of faith or even compliance with the law: it imposes honourable dealing, consideration for others, generosity in thought and action, and self-sacrifice,

MATERIAL THOUGHTS

or at least ■ measure of self-denial, for the common good. It is noteworthy that Christ Our Lord was less disturbed by evidence of the common sins than he was by mean actions. He rebuked sin: 'Go and sin no more,' was all He said to the woman whom he had saved from the death penalty; but the money changers roused his ire. They were law-abiding citizens pursuing their trade, not on holy ground, but in the courtyard of the Temple where they were conducting the legitimate and useful business of selling beasts and birds for sacrifice, and changing foreign money. But Christ knew that they were taking advantage of the ignorance and simplicity of visitors from the country to cheat them, so he overturned their tables and drove them from the Temple. This is where Christianity clashes with commerce.

Christianity permits no laxity of conduct, and as man is prone to err, the Christian, however brave a front he may show to the world, has daily to settle accounts with himself—a process calculated to wound his vanity. Work and pleasure, hurry and bustle provide an anodyne for thought, and he who thrives can drug conscience by flinging a sop to Cerberus in the form of a donation to a hospital or endowment to education; and the applause with which his action is greeted may easily raise him in his own esteem. So religion slides to the background, and with the consequent loss of spiritual strength comes loss of those forces which gave material well-being. The clever generation which knows all that can be learnt gives want in the midst of over-production, bankruptcy, failure and stagnant business with wealth piled up in the banks for lack of honest opportunity; disregard of human life for fear of offending plutocracy in limousines and democracy in motor coaches and on lorries; a Laodicean attitude towards corruption in high places; philosophic patience in the suffering of others. This wallowing in the mire is alien to the great soul of the nation which seems to be bound down for the time being by a false shyness of spiritual yearning, and held in bondage by people educated by the illiterate and led by the echo of their own voices.

VINCENT BASEVI.

THE CONVENTIONAL STAGE

AT the end of the last century there were two homes of tragedy which, to the young of those days, seemed to be built upon imperishable and not altogether antagonistic principles; they were the Lyceum (of Henry Irving, actor) and the Adelphi (of Andrew Melville, playwright). The former patronised by the middle, high-brow, and upper classes, while in the latter oranges were still sucked in the gallery and spittoons provided in the corridors. In the one we saw actors, usually in fancy dress, exploiting their own talents; in the other we met unreal but conventionalized characters in ordinary clothes—the villain who never quite killed the hero, and the heroine who always escaped from the net of evil woven for her fall. This Adelphi realism was different in kind from that of the Lyceum, and still further removed from the emotional type of more recent years. It was bound by convention, even to the necessity of a hook-nosed swarthy villain and a fair-haired, muscularly Saxon hero.

In the Adelphi an audience was never at a loss as to the course of events and took a much fuller part in the proceedings than one which is kept guessing. There was an intimacy between stage and gallery now unthinkable. The modern hero is not cheered as he liberates the heroine—though the play is often interrupted by applause personal to the actor; the modern villain is not hissed; on the contrary, he will receive the same acknowledgment for personal success as the hero. I cannot now imagine an adult audience so engrossed in the play that, when the villain is denying his promise to marry the girl, an indignant voice from the 'gods,' as I once heard it, could shout, 'I 'eard yer, yer bounder!' without sounding unreal and superfluous.

The explanation of the Lyceum mentality may be gathered from *The Book of Martin Harvey*, one of the last survivors of the group to which Henry Irving was leader and an inspiration. He quotes, with approval, 'Talma,

the great French tragedian . . . "By repeated exercises, he (the actor) enters deeply into the emotions, and his speech acquires an accent proper to the personage he has to represent. This done, he goes to the theatre not only to give theatrical effect to his studies, but also to yield himself to the spontaneous flashes of sensibility and all the emotions which it involuntarily produces in him. . . . these impressions are often so evanescent that, on retiring behind the scenes, he must repeat to himself what he has been playing, rather than what he had to play." . . . Consider what consummate works of art must have been such performances when repeated, say, for the hundredth time.'

These 'spontaneous flashes of sensibility' and character study are the devil which has ruined the stage. They affect the box office. Audiences collect to see such art¹; but it was the art of Irving, as it had been of Kean and of Garrick before him, rather than the art of the actor which they paid to witness. Before the nineteenth century such individualistic performances would hardly have been recognized as proper to the stage.

Only those whose memory includes Queen Victoria can appreciate fully the distinction between Lyceum and Adelphi, but all may find a reflection of the same problem in the films. The 'Wild West' drama has retained many of the Adelphic conventions, the hero has almost superhuman qualities and the villain powers of which the devil might be envious—insufficient, however, to thwart the triumph of true love at the end. The individualism of the Lyceum type is found in the wide range of emotional films where the success of the play depends chiefly upon the 'star.' One is self-less, the other individualistic; though each can be good or bad of its kind, attracting or repelling, they are not finally comparable.

Fundamentally this personal art is a type of exhibitionism, the audience went to see Garrick not Macbeth, to see Kean not Sir Giles Overreach, and we remember nothing

¹ Art: anything wherein skill may be attained (*Oxford Dictionary*).

of *The Bells* but Irving's magnetism. This method of 'seeing' is unhappily too usual in these days lightly to be disposed of as a passing weakness. We go to picture galleries, theatres, concerts, Wimbledon and Lords in search not of the works of artists and athletes but to look for personal achievements, exactly as small boys go into the tent of the Fat Woman of the Fair. It might be said that we live in a sight-seeing age. In China the actor is of the lowest social rank, and, like a footman or a railway porter, may do his job without being noticed. The modern actor inheriting the emotional and debased traditions of the last century, works for personal recognition. The painter is in a similar predicament. If we want a picture of a ship, of an Uncle, or of a Madonna, we now expect one of a Brangwyn, of a Matisse, or of the particular artist we approve. Aesthetically the thing which speaks more of the artist than his subject should be condemned out of hand; nothing is more repellent than to ask for a Madonna and be given a mannerism, and nothing should be more repulsive to the stage than the substitution of stars for the play's characters.

This is not a criticism of the art of Garrick, Irving, and the rest. It is merely a reminder that it is not the *actor's* art in which they excelled. We may enjoy the 'radiant motherhood' of a Raphael and yet deny that he has given us a Madonna, just as we may view a trick cyclist in the circus without thinking his agility to be the standard of the Cyclist's Touring Club.

The Lyceum stood for this individualistic type of drama at the moment of its final separation from the conventional stage of which the Adelphi was the last example. It was good of its kind; we went to see Irving and Ellen Terry, and were adequately hypnotized into states of enthusiasm. The Adelphi, unfortunately, was bad of its kind; also, as a source of entertainment for the sophisticated, it was not so successful as its neighbour. Its plays, as literature, were poor and purposely flamboyant; its players wrestled after the histrionic effect which the playwright had denied them, they bent the conventional form to the individualistic as nearly as they could. But its strength was in the relatively

THE CONVENTIONAL STAGE

anonymous, impersonal and detached team work of the caste whose names no man remembers.

The opposition of the conventional to the natural is part of the never ending war between civilization and barbarism. At the moment naturalism has won on most counts, and there are not wanting those who point out its near approach to animalism (*e.g.*, the growing disgust at the Hollywood film). It may not be our affair to judge between one tragedian and another, this dramatist and that, or to be learned in the technique of the theatre; but it is our affair to be informed of the principles of action, for we are all actors—from the morning salutations to the ‘cheerio’ over a ‘night-cap.’ Conventionalism is natural to man; it is a kind of self-protection by which he avoids looking the fool when he has to do anything seen by others. It is the anti-thesis of self-expression. It is good form, and it will return to the stage when our appetites are disciplined in its practice.

HILARY PEPLER.

A UNITED FRONT

IN an admirable article on the Spanish situation by the Dominican Father H. Munoz these words occur¹: 'What Spain needed was an intelligent organizer who could co-ordinate all the disjointed elements into a united front against the destructive forces of irreligion and anarchy.' On reading this it is impossible not to reflect that this is an echo of what many English Catholics have been saying about their own country for a long time.

The present position of Catholics in England is not so very far removed from that of Catholics in Spain just before the revolution. Indifference and lack of organization sold the pass and allowed the forces of an anti-religious Socialism to seize power. And not till the Catholics of Spain found their churches pillaged, convents burned, schools secularized, religious orders expelled and a sheaf of anti-Catholic laws on the statute book did they wake up to the realities of the situation and organize themselves into a force which now promises to be the salvation of Spain.

In England, a generation of ever-increasing indifference in matters of faith and morals has enabled the anti-God propaganda of Moscow to make tremendous progress. The traditional Conservative and Protestant party, product of the Reformation, exists in a fog. In matters of faith and morals they simply do not know where they stand, having neither standards nor guidance. And from not knowing to not caring is but a short step.

Liberalism no longer counts. The more extreme Liberals have gone over to Labour. A few have thrown in their lot with the Conservatives. The rest plough a lonely furrow in the wilderness.

There is, unfortunately, plenty of evidence to show that Labour is strongly tainted with Communism. In spite of official disavowals of Communist sympathies, Labour, with its close ally, the Co-operative Movement, goes hand-in-

¹ BLACKFRIARS, October, 1934.

glove with many of the subversive societies which, under high-sounding titles, are the active agents in this country of Moscow and the world-revolutionary Third International. A Labour Government in unfettered power will certainly mean a government with a Communist outlook and intentions, though it may repudiate the title.

And neither Liberalism nor Conservatism nor any coalition of these parties offers any assurance of security against Moscow's advance: for on many points, particularly issues governed by the moral law, they have the same tainted outlook as Labour, and on others they are indifferent.

In face of this, what does the future hold for Catholics? England is losing its grip on religion, and before long, whatever name it may go under, we shall see a party in power at Westminster holding views which will mean trouble for Catholics, and indeed for all who still revere the Christian tradition. The normal opposition will furnish neither protection nor encouragement for those who stand for the old ideals.

The outlook is black but quite certain. We shall undoubtedly see in the near future laws on the statute book which will do violence to the Catholic and Christian conscience. There will be some protest, of course, but of sturdy opposition none that will have any chance of success unless we avail ourselves of the time that is still ours and organize our forces.

An organized and united Catholic public opinion, backed by a determination to suffer if necessary, is England's great need to-day. For persecution in some form will inevitably follow a Catholic refusal to acquiesce quietly in these new laws which are in the making.

There may be a few people who will protest that this is an exaggeration. And all the while the proofs pile up, day by day. The *Daily Herald*, the *Daily Worker*, the magazines issued by the various co-operative societies, the pamphlets and periodical notes put out by the Christian Protest Movement, the Catholic press and the publications bearing on Communism issued by the Catholic Truth Society are full of them, furnished impartially by

both sides. There are at least twenty-four Communist societies working unmolested in this country for the overthrow of religion and the Christian social order. The co-operative societies are honeycombed with Communist activities; anti-religious films and plays are put on at co-operative halls all over the country, and there is neither action nor protest either by the people of this country or by those whose duty it is to protect the people from the revolution which threatens. The fact that the condoning of this atheistic advance is an insult to God does not seem to concern more than a mere handful of the people, none of the nation's leaders, and apparently not even a majority of Catholics.

The only possible conclusion is that non-Catholic England is tending more and more towards the things for which atheistic Communism stands and with which Catholicism must be for ever at enmity; and Catholics as a body do not yet realize the significance of this. Our fight is no longer against Protestantism, but against creeping atheism. The Catholics of Spain did not realize what threatened them till it was almost too late. But the numerical strength of Spain's Catholics, focussed into unity of action by bold and imaginative leadership, secured for them a second chance. Is it likely that the Catholics of this country, a mere six per cent. or less of the population, would be allowed a second chance?

We know what lack of preparedness and co-ordination has cost the Catholics of Spain. Must we in England also pass through tragic days before we find either leadership or unity? The move rests with our numerous Catholic action societies and their leaders, to create a united front against the destructive forces of irreligion and anarchy in this country *while there is still time*.

T. C. WALTER.

EXTRACTS AND COMMENTS

THE CARDINAL. Seldom has the English secular press devoted so much attention to the deaths of public men as it did to the late Cardinal. Outstanding passages from the countless tributes were collected in THE UNIVERSE for July 5th. Clearly, Cardinal Bourne had aroused a universal interest and admiration which demanded something more than the conventional obituary. Even more gratifying were the understanding and accuracy with which the funeral ceremonies were described in the evening and daily papers. Special credit was due to THE EVENING NEWS, which went far out of its way to explain the details and significance of the ceremony. Fleet Street has at last learned to send competent reporters to ecclesiastical events. The exceptionally foolish anecdote which the gossip-writer in a rival evening paper was allowed to tell of the late Cardinal was the only unintended insult. Among the memoirs in the Catholic press, that by Mr. G. Elliot Anstruther in THE TABLET of January 5th deserves special mention, as does the excellent photograph of the Cardinal which was presented with the same number.

THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM receives considerable attention in the January HOCHLAND. Pastor Karl Ramge contributes a very interesting study on *Vilmar and the Future of German Protestantism*. August Vilmar, Protestant theologian and historian at Marburg in the middle of the last century, would seem to have been a forerunner of Karl Thieme and the contemporary 'Romeward trend' in the Lutheran communion. A convinced Lutheran, his teaching regarding the nature and visibility of the Church, the Priesthood, the Sacraments, the Liturgy, the development of dogma, Our Lady, and even the Primacy of St. Peter approximated closely to that of the Catholic Church. He held that the 'Luther-worship' of Protestants and the 'Luther-phobia' of Catholics had alike misrepresented the real Luther of history. Luther, he considered, never thought of founding a new Church; he sought only to enrich the existing Church with his own religious experience, an experience which is 'eminently Catholic.' 'What we call the Lutheran reformation was in Luther's own intention to be brought about within the existing Church and its hier-

archic organization.' It was Luther's fatal mistake of appealing to the nobles which precipitated the schism and set Lutheranism on a path altogether alien to its true genius; the organizing of a separate Protestant Church being the work, not of Luther, but of Melancthon who himself, nevertheless, expressly acknowledged the Papal authority. The Lutheran confessional Church was the product of political rather than religious forces. 'It is not we,' wrote Vilmar, 'who organize the Church, which has had its own unity and organization since the Ascension of Our Lord. On the contrary, it is we who are sanctified by entering into the existing institution of the Church.' The implication of the article is that authentic Lutheranism at the present time can fulfil its providential destiny only by seeking to return to its source, the Catholic Church.

The same number contains a translation into German of Vladimir Soloviev's *The Vision the Union of the Churches* and a most instructive *Conversation on Unity with a Romish Orthodox* by Karl Pfleger. The writer offers some pertinent criticism of the position of those Orthodox who seek, in association with Anglicans and Old Catholics, a 'Non-Roman Catholicism.' The 'Romish Orthodox' with whom he converses is M. Kobilenski-Ellis, editor and commentator of the Mainz edition of Soloviev's works. Interest is added to Kobilenski's views by the fact that he is, it would seem, an extreme Slavophile intensely devoted to Orthodoxy. He has made his personal solution of the problem of reunion by reception into communion with the Apostolic See, but he insists that corporate reunion must be the object of endeavour both on the side of Catholicism and of Orthodoxy. In Catholicism alone can Orthodoxy fulfil its God-given mission; but Catholics must recognize the inherent values of Orthodoxy and the fact that it 'is not merely a complexus of dogmas and rites, it is a psychological condition.' The establishment of mutual understanding and appreciation is the first condition of reunion. The 'conversation' contains much that is exceedingly helpful for understanding the problem of reunion between East and West, but also much that is applicable to the problem of reunion generally by indicating the attitude which Catholics should adopt to all forms of non-Catholic Christianity.

EXTRACTS AND COMMENTS

FAITH OUTSIDE THE FOLD. The same matter is admirably treated in an article under this title by Mr. W. J. Blyton in the January number of *THE MONTH*. Its thesis is that finely stated by Von Hügel when he wrote: 'Only if there are fragments, earlier stages and glimpses of truth and goodness extant wheresoever some little sincerity exists, can the Catholic Church even conceivably be right. For though Christianity and Catholicism be the culmination and fullest norm of all religion, yet to be such they must find something thus to crown and measure: various degrees of, or preparations for, their truth have existed long before they came, and exist still, far and wide, now that they have come.' Or as Mr. Blyton puts it: '*Incompleteness* is the handicap of non-Catholic systems: incompleteness even more than downright negation. It is for us to supplement them.' He therefore urges:

To Catholics who would commend their Faith to others, this idea of the intellectual world should be a practical help in method, no less than an incentive to witness, and to give a reason for the Hope that is in them. It will help them to listen knowledgably to the *affirmative* sayings of their non-Catholic and non-Christian acquaintance as more significant and real very often than their negations or omissions. The *positive* element affords us a handle, and the best handle. You can go with a man a mile, and by doing so perhaps persuade him to go with you twain. Some of their fragmentary creeds are actually vestiges of the Catholic Faith, and as such are at once recognizable by us: but others are possibly more part of the heritage of human affections, the unspoiled part of nature, the parental or social instinct, the sympathies. In either case, they are to be welcomed and understood—and linked on to what we have to offer.

The writer instances a recent discussion which our readers may recognize:

In the ecclesiastical sphere there is controversy among us as to whether Anglo-Catholicism is a half-way house which keeps people from Catholicism, or whether it is a bridge to the Church. Surely the witness of facts and figures should help us here. Statistics say that it is a bridge, a passage-way and an introduction, for many, and this should guide our behaviour and argument with those who have come thus far toward us. What is true of them is true, in different ways, of others. There is a great amount of good faith in the world which has not yet found its goal . . . Merely to be shocked, therefore, at

views or people differing from us is an unfruitful, *naïve* reaction. Better to learn from them, see their point, and answer it. This was Our Lord's patient way . . . Tolerance that is built on understanding and not on indifference is a great opener of the eyes and mind. Indignation or fear, on the contrary, stop up ears and eyes; and the interview closes as it began, in estrangement, when it might have been a useful exchange of ideas and a growth in love and esteem. Our Lord, claiming to fulfil the words that Isaias spoke of Him, shows tender regard for the injured reed and the flickering lamp-wick. Shall his followers heedlessly break and quench?

ANGLO-CATHOLICISM—BRIDGE OR BARRIER? Mr. Blyton would probably agree with us, however, when we say that the 'Bridge-or-Barrier' controversy is, in the last resort, to be decided less by statistics than by discovering the purposes of Providence; less a matter of which Anglo-Catholicism is than which it *should* be, a line of inquiry in which 'facts and figures' are doubtless of great service. It seems opportune to quote the careful statement of our contributor, Dr. Oskar Bauhofer, in an article on *The Anglican Riddle* in SCHWEIZERISCHE RUNDSCHAU (July 1932), written shortly after his return from the German-British theological conference at Chichester:

For many souls Anglo-Catholicism is the bridge, the gateway for a return to the true Church. But for very many more it is rather the barrier which withholds them from taking this step, because it seems to render such a step superfluous: *Hic Ecclesia Anglicana—Ecclesia Christi*. There are comparatively few who see through the Anglo-Catholic illusion. But it certainly does not follow from this that the Catholic should seize every occasion to attack Anglo-Catholicism as such in every form. The Roman Catholic must recognize and reverence a special manifestation of God's grace in this Catholic movement in the Church of England. But at the same time it is clear to him that Anglo-Catholicism misinterprets the meaning and the providential purpose of this outpouring of divine grace . . . The Catholic does not deny the evident workings of divine grace within the Anglo-Catholic movement, which nevertheless, in so far as it is Anglo-Catholicism—self-sufficient and self-contained, seeking no end beyond its own frontiers—he can only regard as something which completely misconceives its own destiny. The Catholic knows that without the Anglo-Catholic movement the greater number of conversions from Anglicanism to the Catholic Church would, humanly speaking, have never

taken place. He should therefore be thankful that non-Roman Anglo-Catholicism, and indeed Anglicanism generally, has spread abroad in the non-Catholic world a distinct 'memento' of Catholic values, although it has afforded at the same time a dangerous centre within the confines of Protestantism itself which, in accordance with the law of least resistance, attracts to itself awakening Catholic tendencies. Anglo-Catholicism is, by God's grace, a reminiscence and a reminder of the Catholic home, a reminiscence and a reminder which is misunderstood by men as the reality itself. Anglo-Catholicism cannot find its meaning and its goal within itself, but only by ascending to the *Una Catholica*; by ceasing, in short, to be Anglo-Catholicism.

This thesis was more fully developed by Dr. Bauhofer in an essay, *A Century of Anglo-Catholicism*, of which BLACKFRIARS published a summary (July 1933).

POETRY AND POLITICS. Bourgeois civilization has accustomed us to take neither poetry nor politics seriously; neither is considered to have any relation to 'real life'; the former is regarded rather as a distraction from it, the latter a game confined to professional players. Yet a new generation of poets, writers and artists has arisen among us: 'the poetry of Wystan Auden, Cecil Day Lewis, John Lehmann, Charles Madge and Stephen Spender, all of whom are concerned, to varying extents, with problems of action, and therefore of morality and politics.' The significance of this new trend (or should we say, this revolution?) in contemporary poetry should be understood and appreciated by Christians who have much to learn from it; an excellent introduction to its study will be found in *Poetry and Propaganda* by Michael Roberts in the January LONDON MERCURY (with which is now incorporated *The Bookman*). The article has the additional value that it is a study of the whole relation of 'pure' literature to propaganda and to life. The new poets (whose politics are, for the most part, definitely 'Left') are not propagandists in any ordinary sense of the word; but 'they write of those things which they feel most deeply' among which the social chaos and injustice of our day takes first place. The movement is a sharp and welcome reaction from the literature of disillusion and pragmatism which marked the post-War decade. We need not share the Communistic prepossessions and aspirations of these poets to agree that

at least they are trying to bring poetry back into the life of the common man by bringing the common man back into poetry. And unless some such effort is made, unless our intellectual tradition is extended to include all classes, democracy in every form must fail. It is not enough that a few professors in the universities, a recluse here and there, a schoolmaster who dare not speak, should have a just appreciation of the issues—and leave the fields to the press lords and the advertisers. It is not enough to wait for a revolution to tidy our lives for us. The direction of that revolution depends upon the action which we take now, and that action may include political action, but it must consist chiefly of the rebuilding of warped and broken personalities, so that the people may act clearly and without humbug.

'Left' literature should, however, be studied in its own organs. Of these *LEFT REVIEW*, organ of the Writers International, is the most representative of official Marxism. Its position may be said to be fairly stated by Montagu Slater in the January number when he writes: 'The strongest argument for a Writers' International, is that it can bring writers into touch with life. 'Life' in this context equals the class-struggle—for proof of which vast claim I can only refer readers to . . . all issues past and future of *Left Review*.' The place which the writer is conceived to occupy in the proletarian revolution is instructively explained. Winifred Holtby's *What we read and why we read it*, D. S. Mirsky's *Intelligentsia*, and Allen Hunt's *Flint and Steel English* hold many lessons for ourselves, if only on the principle *fas est ab hoste doceri*. But no less interesting than the position of *Left Review* is that of the more independently minded *ADELPHI*. A *Semi-Editorial Soliloquy* in the January number describes its evolution from the 'sometimes exuberant and sometimes laborious explorations' of its early days to the very interesting form of Socialism which it now expresses. Its inspirer, Mr. John Middleton Murry, is plainly conscious of the inadequacies of Marxist materialism (see his *Dostoevsky and Russia* in the December number) and dissatisfied with contemporary organized Socialism and Labour. In his *Looking before and after* in the January number he invokes the *mystique* of Péguy to supply their deficiencies. We venture to think that Mr. Murry would find himself more at home in the 'personalist' revolutionary movements, which owe much of their inspiration to Péguy, than in any form of Socialism.

EXTRACTS AND COMMENTS

CATHOLIC REVOLUTIONARIES. On November 28th the *Tribune Libre* of Brussels assembled to listen to an exposition of these 'personalist' revolutionary movements which have sprung up in recent years among young Catholics and others in France and Belgium. The report of the meeting in *LE ROUGE ET LE NOIR* (December 5th) is very instructive. The debate was opened by M. Jean Thévenet, a young Catholic lawyer. He related the history of the movement from its 'literary' beginnings in *La jeunesse nouvelle*, shortly after the War. He explained that the movement was still in its preliminary stages of study, discussion and criticism, a movement of a minority only. 'Our Catholic youth,' M. Thévenet explained, 'seeks the establishment of a new order by means of revolution.' Revolution does not necessarily mean violence; it means the complete transformation of existing institutions. M. de Becker, founder of *Esprit nouveau*, perhaps the most vigorous of the Catholic revolutionary movements in Belgium, showed that the spirit of Catholicism and the spirit of revolution were in full accord. 'The essential thing for a Catholic is to seek the Kingdom of God by his own spiritual development, a thing which may often demand a revolution of institutions.' But while all Catholics must agree in demanding a civil régime favourable to the attainment of their supernatural end, they are free to disagree as to the means to be employed. Catholics are consequently divided, as Socialists are, into 'revolutionaries' and 'reformists.'

Our ultimate aim is to re-establish a civilization on Christian foundations, a Christian nation, a Christian culture; and by this we do not mean a return to the theocratic state of the Middle Ages . . . Our first principle is reverence for man; hence we shall tolerate no dictatorship. Shall we employ violence? Certainly we live under a tyranny which renders violence lawful. But violence implies a contempt for the adversary; a thing we cannot admit. First of all we shall try all pacific means to bring about our revolution; if these fail we shall have recourse to passive resistance. Love of our enemies and the search for truth are the first principles of our doctrine.

Subsequent speakers attacked the official 'Catholic' party in the Belgian Parliament for its compromises with capitalism and showed the affinities and contrasts between revolutionary Socialism and revolutionary Christianity.

'The Socialists seek a revolution which is no true revolution. A revolution is a reversal of essential values. The Socialists call themselves anti-capitalist. In reality they are not so. They do not attack the *basis* of capitalism, the frightful tyranny of production over men.' The lethargy of Catholics, their infidelity to the teaching and instructions of the encyclicals, were vigorously attacked. The whole report serves as a very useful introduction to the study of a movement which deserves to be better known in this country. A more detailed account of the groups which comprise it, their aims, affinities and differences, their debt to Bloy and Péguy, will be found in *Young France and Social Justice*, by M. N. Berdyaev, in the January DUBLIN REVIEW.

ROME AND SOVIET CINEMA. Those who have been led to suppose that the Church's attitude to Cinema is uniformly reactionary, negative and uncomprehending will be happily disillusioned by the enlightened and well-informed Film Page, complete with stills, which is now a regular feature of the official Vatican organ, L'OSSERVATORE ROMANO. The issue of January 13th contains an article (translated from that in THE CATHOLIC HERALD, December 29th), by Mr. G. M. Turnell on the lessons of the Soviet cinema and the efforts of the 'Kino' organization of the English Marxists 'whose energy and enterprise in the field of film art compares favourably with the tentative efforts made by Catholics; for in spite of the Pope's encouragement, Catholic opinion is still too divided and the ignorance too great for anything practical to be done.' May Rome's fine lead soon remedy this state of things!

TAILPIECE. 'Can it be that unknown to us, Mr. Aldous Huxley is a *sub rosa* Dominican?'—EVERYMAN (January 4th).

PENGUIN.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND THE NATIONAL DECLARATION

To the Editor of BLACKFRIARS

SIR,—It was a profound shock to read in an enlightened journal like yours the Editorial on the National Declaration. The opposition which that straightforward and simply-worded document has aroused is, on the face of it, very difficult to understand, and the hostility of so many Catholics most disturbing. The League of Nations Union is avowedly a propagandist body. Is there anything wrong in that? Are not we Catholics the most bare-faced propagandists going? And is not the ascertainment of public opinion a perfectly legitimate aim, and what method can be more direct than the one adopted? And how else are the upholders of the League and its principles to combat the pernicious campaign waged against them by *The Mail* and *The Express*?

The conviction forces itself on me that it is simply narrow-mindedness which makes many Catholics hostile to any movement outside their own body. Such an outlook reflects little credit and will do them and the Catholic cause much harm. They seem, moreover, to entirely forget the public pronouncements of Catholic authorities, beginning with the Holy Father himself, in favour of the League.

I quite fail to follow your view that there can be no peace until the Nations accept the Incarnation; in other words, until the whole world is converted to Christianity. Are we to make no effort for peace till the millions of China and India are converted? And if you dislike the achievement of spiritual and moral aims by organization and machinery, are not Catholics doing just the same in societies like the C.E.G. and heaps of others, methods which Catholics have employed all through their history?

In a word, peace is the first and greatest object of the League of Nations. What is there to put in its place, if it fails, as there is great danger of its doing, if it does not get the support of all right-minded persons, irrespective of creed and race?

Yours faithfully,

FRANCIS HUGHESDON.

[Mr. Hughesdon errs in supposing that Catholics in general or we in particular are hostile to the League of Nations or to its propaganda in the cause of peace. We merely refuse to close our eyes to the omission of the only really important factor

for its attainment. We criticized the Peace Ballot (and indirectly the League of Nations), therefore, for one reason alone, namely because in its search for lasting peace it fails to take into consideration the only real guarantee of such a peace. In any contract the only reliable assurance of the observance of its terms is a sense of moral responsibility on the part of the contracting parties. But the self-sacrifice implied in the moral guarantee of international peace must be motivated by something higher than national security, higher than world prosperity, higher even than natural brotherly love. It is so sublime in its implications that it demands a motive as exalted as that of Calvary, a supernatural, even a divine, motive. The majority of the nations subscribing to the League are professedly Christian, yet the commandment of Christianity—*Love one another as I have loved you*—is not apparently thought worthy of serious consideration as a basis of peace. Let us by all means use organization and machinery, but let us use them to spread knowledge and acceptance of the social principles of Christianity; otherwise our leagues and our peace pacts will provide at best only a jealous defensiveness and will be at worst just so many more 'scraps of paper.' Our Divine Saviour has given us a practical rule of life: *Seek first the Kingdom of God*, to which he has added a magnificent assurance: *And all these things shall be added unto you*. The Christian nations, at least, must be urged to recognize this as the primary essential of peace; otherwise the machinery and organization of the League are doomed to failure and the laudable efforts of its supporters misdirected and wasted. That is the point of our criticism.—ED.]

REVIEWS

THEOLOGY AND RELIGION

THE CHURCH OF GOD. (An Anglo-Russian Symposium.) By the Members of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius. (S.P.C.K. ; 7/6.)

Dr. Frere in the preface tells us that this book is a collection of essays on various aspects of the doctrine of the Church. He adds that this topic has been much neglected in all the discussions on Reunion.

Of these eleven essays five are by Anglicans and the rest by Russian members of the Orthodox Church. To speak of the Anglican papers first. Those on *Christ and the Church* and *The Biblical conception of the Church in relation to the world* by the Rev. E. L. Mascall and Canon H. L. Goudge respectively seem to us not to set forth any specific Church of England statement on the subject, but rather (especially in the case of the first essay) to view the matter almost from an orthodox angle. This is still more true of the essay on the *Communion of Saints* by the Rev. D. J. Chitty. He has assimilated the Orthodox feeling in regard to the saints and their cult, but he betrays some bitterness and historical bias badly out of place in a book of this character, by such remarks as 'the rebellion against Rome (at the Reformation) was itself evidence of a blind desire for Orthodoxy still alive in the Western spirit,' and by his deletion of the names of St. Anselm and St. Thomas of Canterbury from his list of saints.

Of the two remaining Anglican papers, that of Ivan Young on *Eucharistic Worship* is very disappointing, being full of words and very little clarity of definition; that by Canon K. E. Kirk on *Loyalty to the Church* is a clever essay giving the historical basis of the comprehensiveness of the Church of England.

The most interesting papers, however, for a Catholic are those of the Russian contributors. They are six in number, and except for Mr. G. P. Fedotov's on *Orthodoxy and Historical Criticism* and Father S. Bulgakov's on *Religion and Art*, all have direct bearing on the *Thesis de Ecclesia*. We will only treat of three of these essays. The most outstanding is that on *Sobornost; The Catholicity of the Church*, by the Rev. G. V. Florovsky. Here the professor sets forth the Orthodox view of the Church. He emphasizes the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Christ and the unity of its members by grace. Here Catholics would be in full agreement. But just as there has been a tendency which still lingers among our theologians to stress the exterior aspect of the Church and almost to forget the internal aspect, so some of the statements here are even more one-sided and could not be admitted by Catholics, e.g., 'In the Church there is not and cannot be any outward authority.' Yet in fairness must be quoted

what had gone before which seems a contradiction of the above statement, *viz.*, 'The hierarchs have received this power to teach, not from the church-people, but from the High Priest, Jesus Christ, in the Sacrament of Orders.' To which is added, 'but this teaching finds its limits in the expression of the whole church.'

In *The Church and National Life* Mr. Kartashov gives some interesting explanations of the Church's attitude to the State both in Byzantine times and in the modern Orthodox national states. He also recognizes that times have changed and advocates the forming of extra-territorial unions among the scattered Orthodox Churches in order to oppose the pagan nationalism, and this as a stage towards the Unity of the Christian World.

Mr. Zernov treats of *The Church and the Confessions*. He begins by comparing the Catholic and Protestant conception of the Church, but he sees only the legalistic and counter-Reformation elements in the Catholic Religion. He stresses the corporate conception of the Church which some of our teachers have undervalued, but at the same time he seems to suggest that man is not ultimately responsible for his own salvation. Yet he is quite honest in the criticism of his own Church, and his call on Christians to prepare the way for Reunion by a spirit of repentance and charity is quite Catholic in tone.

To speak of the whole collection of essays we will say frankly that while they are an inspiration to all workers in the cause, we cannot but regret that it was not possible to add some Catholic papers. The writers have often missed the point rather by what they have left unsaid than by what they say. We will conclude with a statement made by Mgr. d'Herbigny at Cambridge in 1923: 'England and the East re-act one upon the other; for while English influence tends to break down Oriental prejudice against the West, the East tends to check and to extinguish the Protestant heresies of England.' Much has happened since 1923!

BEDE WINSLOW, O.S.B.

THE BURDEN OF BELIEF. By Ida Fr. Coudenhove. Translated by Conrad M. R. Bonacina. Introduction by Gerald Vann, O.P. (Sheed & Ward; 3/6.)

It is said that twenty thousand copies of *Von der Last Gottes*—the title of the original German of this book—have been sold. It is much to be wished, but hardly to be expected, that this translation will have a correspondingly large sale in English-speaking countries. Unfortunately the complexity of its style and the profundity of its thought are unlikely to recommend it to a wide public.

The dialogue-form which the Gräfin Coudenhove adopts is not an easy one to handle, and does not always lend itself to clearness of exposition. But it enables her here, as in her other works, to take a very live and concrete problem (in this case a Catholic's misgivings in reclaiming a lapsed Catholic friend) and to thresh out all its implications without the restrictions imposed by a more logically ordered essay. The problem which the present book sets out to solve is that of our apostolate. 'Why do we Christians bring all this unrest into the world? Why should we think of converting "decent" people . . . far finer specimens of humanity, healthier minded, more genuine, more worthy of esteem than so many of us who believe?'

The discussion inevitably leads far afield: to the purpose of missionary activity, the character of paganism and neo-paganism, the nature of Christianity and of the Church, and, more especially, the inter-relation of nature and grace. It is on this point that the book is most valuable and salutary, but it is just here that the authoress speaks an idiom which the majority of Catholics will find unfamiliar and perplexing. She has assimilated to the full the 'sin-consciousness' of St. Augustine and of Luther (whom, on this point, she quotes with reverence and admiration), and of the neo-Lutheranism of Kierkegaard and Barth. The antithesis of grace and sin-laden nature is thrown into terrifying relief which will shock those accustomed to the 'ethic of the "good will" and the "we all belong to God" attitude.'

She scourges implacably those who make Christianity a facile thing, 'with every modern comfort at moderate prices' (and those who would seem to give official approbation to such a presentation of it), as well as those who would reduce it to no more than a sublimated humanism. 'Since when has Christianity been just a system of morals or a "world-conception" or even a discipline for the building up of personality? . . . It is not merely a matter of "prodigality" and crowning of nature in grace (how could it be, man being what he is?); it is a matter of Redemption. Certainly the former is also true, but only in the second place; first comes the simple and terrible alternative, and the question: Who can be saved?—the question of the mercy of God's grace.'

But if the authoress has learned much from Lutheran thinkers she has also succeeded where they have failed. As in the writings of Fr. Przywara, the truths which have been re-emphasized by the neo-Lutherans are shown in true perspective in their due place in the Catholic dogmatic synthesis. The stress on the dogma of Redemption is balanced (as in St. Augustine) by an acute realization of the implications of the dogma of the

Incarnation and its continuance in the Mystical Body. Despite the sublimity and difficulty of the Christian calling, Christianity can never be an esoteric religion nor the Church a congregation of an *élite*. Here the writer is at her best. She is painfully aware of the sharp contrast between Christian theory and Christian practice, and horrified by the spectacle of contemporary bourgeois Catholicism, the 'prudery, vulgarity, cant, pharisaism, lack of intellectual candour, emotionalism' of a typical devout Catholic. 'Have you ever watched a Christian street-procession, studied it as a procession of physiognomies, and not felt depressed and repelled by the spectacle it offers?' But she sees 'how utterly God threw everything into the hazard when He delivered Himself up to reality, and the truly terrifying, humble, heroic obedience of the Church which dares to take upon herself the burden of humanity just as it is, to deliver herself up to it, to expose herself to a martyrdom of degradation . . . That I call taking the mystery of the Incarnation seriously.'

It is a magnificent book, and if sometimes it would seem to overstate its case, it should for that reason be all the more powerful as a corrective to degenerate misconceptions of our Christian calling and inheritance. It is filled with hard sayings; but those who can receive them would do well to ponder upon them and communicate them in simpler form to others, for its message is for *all*.

Fr. Vann's Introduction shows how much of the argument can be re-cast in vigorous but more homely English.

VICTOR WHITE, O.P.

THE WAY OF SIMPLICITY. By W. E. Orchard, D.D. (Putnam; 5/-).

The theme of this book is the essential simplicity of the spiritual life in practice, a point which much needs stressing in relief of those many whose subconscious persuasion, anyway, is that on the contrary it is very elaborate and complicated—almost as if God had fitted us with one kind of nature and had then made demands upon us which it would require a quite different one to meet. No doubt, as Dr. Orchard says in his first chapter, this erroneous impression is very largely due to the bewildering wealth of didactic, analytical, expository, and hortatory (not to say minatory) literature on the subject which is almost thrust upon all who begin to take their spiritual life seriously—the wood smothered by the trees. His effort, therefore, is to show (and he succeeds) that in loving and serving God, in aiming at the highest ideal that we can see, we are not doing violence to our nature but are fulfilling it.

St. Augustine says that God has so made us that we can find rest and peace nowhere else than in Him : and again, that if we *wish* to love Him, the thing is done, 'Amicus Dei esse si voluero, ecce nunc fio !' As Dr. Orchard insists, directly or indirectly, in every chapter of his book, the desire to make progress (as we somewhat self-centredly call it) must be real, must be the dominating desire among no matter how many others, must be the genuine statement of my true self : after that the way is simple. He does not say that it will be simple in the sense of making no call upon our strength and courage, upon our faith our hope and our charity : certainly not. But it will be simple in the sense that the issue and its implications will be clear, the way quite definite, the truth unequivocal, the life harmonious.

Many people do not believe this : they are persuaded that if a thing is worth having it must be difficult to do : that if knowledge is worth having it must cost much to acquire. They are right : but they forget, or have never understood, what they might so easily have learned from the words of Christ Himself, that to follow Him means without doubt to carry a burden and to bear a yoke, yet because by so doing they are making themselves one with Him who alone perfectly obeyed that one simple Great Commandment—the *unum necessarium*—to love God above all things, the very pain and labour that they still will not cease to feel will become to them no other thing than sheer happiness and complete contentment.

R. H. J. STEUART, S.J.

USE YOUR REASON. First of all about God. By Joseph O'Connor. (C.T.S. Pamphlet ; 2d.)

It seems to us that this pamphlet is so important and so valuable, notwithstanding its necessary brevity, that it should not be allowed to pass without special notice. It is intended primarily by the author for children about to leave school, and he has a remarkable gift for reaching the young mind and capturing it. (Already his *Between Ourselves* Talks to Boys pamphlets published by the C.T.S. have exceeded a circulation of 100,000.) But he provides in fact a treatise in Natural Theology that will provide mental food in a palatable and, even more important, in a digestible form for people of almost any age or education. In these days of agnosticism and atheism no Catholic will deny the urgent need of a reasonable defence of the very fundamentals of religious belief, but only those whose duty it is to formulate this defence will know the difficulty of presenting it simply and intelligibly in the vernacular. With remarkable success the author of this pamphlet has undertaken to reduce the sublimest philosophical truths to the level of comprehension of children. He deals with the Existence of God, with the nature of Being and

of Matter, with the Divine Attributes, with Providence and with Miracles, all in the simplest of language and all within the narrow compass of the familiar C.T.S. pamphlet. He not only makes this intelligible but intensely interesting. We do not, of course, pretend that it exhausts the possibilities of this method of treatment. Admirable in itself, it is even more admirable as an indication of what yet remains to be done, especially in the cause of the New Apologetic. In the meantime, while we wait hopefully for fuller and completer treatises along the lines indicated, we sincerely trust that this invitation to 'use their reason' will be widely accepted by Catholics and offered to the notice of non-Catholic enquirers. Especially do we venture to recommend it to the consideration of the active members of the C.E.G.

HILARY CARPENTER, O.P.

PHILOSOPHY

THE TRANSFORMATION OF NATURE IN ART. By Ananda K. Coomaraswamy. (Harvard University Press; \$3.)

A book by Dr. Coomaraswamy needs no commendation: and the present is as thought-provoking and accomplished a one as any that he has written. His theme, of course, is the theory of art in Asia: a theory which with singular charm and skill he develops, explains and brings home to an Occidental reader. If to-day the West appreciates at all Indian art, the merit belongs to such pioneers as our author and Mr. E. B. Havell: and the success of the Indian Society's recent Exhibition of Modern Indian Art at the New Burlington Galleries proves that their voices are no longer crying in a wilderness.

What is of special interest to a Catholic is the remarkable *rapprochement* between Hindu and Catholic aesthetics that this book effects: contrasting both together with modern, post-Renaissance, art in Europe. Dr. Coomaraswamy reveals himself as a serious student of St. Thomas Aquinas, who indeed is freely quoted in the pages of this book; to him 'the scholastic view is more than a great provincial school of thought, it represents a universal mode of thought, and this mode throws a light on the analogous theories that have prevailed in Asia, and should serve Western students as a means of approach to, and understanding of, Asiatic art.'

To him—as to us—'art is by nature rational; aesthetic experience is, as Eckhardt calls it, the vision of the world-picture as God sees it, loving all creatures alike, not as of use, but as the image of himself in himself'; his reproach to modern, Western, Art is, that 'it is no longer creative, imitating an exemplary form, but merely a succedaneum, more or less apt to titillate the senses'—that in fact 'post-Renaissance European Art

takes on the aspect of a reanimation of the corpses in a charnel house, rather than that of a Resurrection of the Dead in a more glorious form.' He sums up the Asiatic theory of art under two heads : ' (1) that aesthetic experience is an ecstasy in itself inscrutable, but in so far as it can be defined, a delight of the reason ; (2) that in the analogy of art (*sâdrüçya*) Heaven and Earth are united in an ordering of sensation to intelligibility and an ultimate perfection in which the seer perceives all things imaged in himself '—which *sâdrüçya* he defines in the words of the Angelic Doctor as that ' *ratio pulchri quae consistit in quadam consonantia diversorum.*' As for the history of art (which in the West, he caustically observes, ' has been replaced by a history of artists '), he pokes deserved fun at those who ' suppose that art was unintelligible and that artists, in the goodness of their hearts, were trying to make it comprehensible either to themselves or others—which is as if to suppose that speakers made sounds with a view to the subsequent formation of a valid means of communication.' And if it is asked, Why every work of art is not immediately intelligible, he replies : ' Because the artist sees only what of the express image his powers permit ; for, as constantly asserted by Scholastic philosophy, the thing known is in the knower according to the mode of the knower.'

One is tempted to go on quoting : but one would rather refer the reader to the book itself. Let me only add one warning, in order to avoid misunderstandings : Dr. Coomaraswamy, admirable as he is—one would fain say, good Catholic as he is in his aesthetics, is not really a Catholic in the innermost ' ground ' of his thought. His failure to take the last fence crystallizes around his unhappy rendering of *Deva* (=divine being) as ' angel,' so that in the end God, *Mahâdeva*, is called ' the Supreme Angel ' and ' Angel of the Angels.' The latter term he compares with our *Rex angelorum*, but he does not seem to realize that the difference between God being one of the angels and being their King, is not merely a difference of phraseology, as he seems to suggest, but an abyss separating our concept of God and its contradiction (*cf.* p. 22, where the author would make his reader believe that *creation* is merely ' a religious translation of what in metaphysics is spoken of as *emanation* ').

But I would not end on this note, necessary though it seems to me to sound it, but rather on the joy that comes from seeing that, at a long last, Hindus are discovering Catholicism. That this discovery should take place *via* Aesthetics, may seem quaint : at all events, Dr. Coomaraswamy is not alone in this—only a year ago Mr. Mulkraj Anand (in his *The Hindu View of Art*, prefaced by Mr. Eric Gill) drew the same close parallel between the Hindu and the Catholic concept of art. That the Hindu

approach should be rather through the Beautiful than through the True or the Good—who is there to command the spirit, not to blow where it listeth? Hitherto Catholicism—for a multiplicity of historical reasons—has to the average Hindu seemed not worth knowing: now that, here and there, eminent Hindus are beginning to see that Catholicism is worth studying and are beginning to know it, is there not every hope that, with God's grace, they will end by understanding it?

H. C. E. ZACHARIAS.

DIEU SOLEIL DES ESPRITS. La Doctrine Augustinienne de l'Illumination. By Régis Jolivet. (Desclée de Brouwer; Frs. 12.)

Some modern expounders of Plato suggest that he never disclosed his proper conclusions in philosophical thought, that his mind spent itself in secret musings. Neither Aristotle nor Augustine so treated him. Both accepted his account of the 'Ideas' seriously. 'The crux of all Platonism, of the whole Tradition,' to quote Dr. Schiller, 'is that it is vital to Platonism to project beyond our present life a transcendent realm of intelligible and eternal Being that hovers above the flux of sensible Becoming. For unless this is done there is no stable background over which the shadows of the Cave can flit: moreover, in Plato's eyes at least, the very form of rational communication and of predication, "*is*," attested that such being *could* be asserted. Yet by weird fatality as soon as intelligible being had been affirmed it generated an insoluble problem as to the relation of Being and Becoming, of the sensible and the intelligible. All Plato's loftiest flights were shattered by this obstacle and none of his successors have failed so gallantly . . . the resources of every language have been exhausted to render intelligible the ineffable nexus which attaches the world of sense to the world of intuitive reason or spirit as Dean Inge prefers to call it' (*Mind*, July 1934, p. 387). Does Jolivet relieve St. Augustine of 'failing gallantly' in his criticism of this tradition?

To follow Jolivet, what does St. Augustine make of this problem? Certitude is got by principles known by the light of reason, our reason, by which God speaks interiorly. Certitude is not given by exterior matter or fact; by an exterior master. And if the latter takes us from conclusions to principles again we should not accept his science unless we had the certitude of the principles into which consequences are resolved within our minds. As Jolivet sees it: 'The real problem for Augustine is to explain the certitude of our judgments—this is the problem of Illumination—but not the formation of concepts.' Can these

be separated? How is the judgment of existence, when we judge this man to be, applicable, unless we can resolve it by the senses, by the sensible visible thing? The senses are the guarantors of 'this' existence. A metaphysician deprived of his senses and of what they convey would be an impossibility for an Aristotle or St. Thomas, not only because ideas come through the senses, but also because the senses are speculatively indispensable for science, even for the science the most elevated and immaterial. The actual existence of the sensible world which science cannot ignore can only be attained indirectly by the mind going beyond its proper sphere through the ministration of the senses. Not thus St. Augustine. For him there are no 'concepts' of the existence of sensible substances. His notion of the rôle of the soul forbids it. The soul which rules the body cannot receive from the lower thing. The soul for him is a complete substance *using* the body, and therefore, as Jolivet notes, it is not a joint substance of body and soul which simultaneously and indivisibly is the subject in which the images, phantasies and bodily similitudes are conserved. This Jolivet calls the 'sensible memory,' and he points out that with Augustine the similitudes confided to the memory are not identical with impressions received by the sense organs: they are spiritual. If sensation is the product of the soul, reminiscence is much more so. This doctrine of memory which our critic declares is the centre of this whole system of Illuminism is thus summed up by G. S. Brett in his work, *The Psychology of Religion*: 'From the assertion that the object of consciousness is always our own states, it follows that memory is always of ourselves and not of things.' We can even say in a sense that memory is the soul itself, remarks Jolivet, quoting the Saint in the *Confessions* (X, c. xiv, ii, 2, 1, *Hic vero cum animus sit etiam ipsa memoria*). He clearly sees the embarrassments which a definition of man by the soul alone gets him into. *Apropos* of this dilemma, he draws upon M. Gilson, who boldly maintains 'that the abstract (*sic*!) problem of the metaphysical structure of man seems rather idle to Augustine, and that, on the other hand, if he had tried to solve it, would have seemed insoluble, for the want of a doctrine of act and potency helping him to understand the metaphysical structure of composite existences.' A simple 'message' addressed to the soul to form corporeal similitudes—*information* as the Saint sometimes calls it—is not, as our critic discerns, got from without the soul, 'for these similitudes avoid the universal flux of things, while the impressions of the senses are perpetually changing' (*de Trinit.*, V, c., 5, 7, 8). The contrary, then, of what *information* is for Aristotle as for St. Thomas.

Augustine himself realizes the difficulty of solving the problem of the union of the soul and body by his definition of man by the soul—in his eyes a complete substance (*de Morib. Eccles.*, L. 1, c. iv-6), and remarks that this problem is secondary. What is at stake is to affirm the superiority of the soul. As Père Cayre says, 'What intrigued Augustine was the value of existence perceived intellectually rather than the methodical analysis of the conditions in which this intuition is obtained.' But as R. P. Bissen (approved by Jolivet) shows, 'there is no intention of giving us a theory of knowledge in the strict sense of the word.' What does Jolivet mean, then, by telling us on p. 174 that there is no innateness in the formation of the intelligible ideas on this theory, but only an innateness of the conditions of science and wisdom: that the corporeal similitudes have only been formed by the soul and 'given' to the memory, thanks to the help of sensations? Nor does he tell us where the intelligible content, the quiddity of external substance, comes from, for he denies the theory of an infusion into the soul of intelligible ideas entirely formed. Hence he does not clearly decide, as does M. Gilson, 'that St. Augustine has never distinguished the problem of the content of thought from that of the judgment, nor the problem of judgment in general from that of a true particular judgment in whatever interpretation of his doctrine one comes to.' Neither memory-images nor formal reasons nor absolute principles explain the lack of the concept, its intelligible content of sensible substance. On the other hand, Jolivet does not attempt to conciliate the divergence in the teaching of St. Augustine and St. Thomas on the rôle of the Illumination of the human mind by the Divine Mind. Both agree as to the necessity for the human mind to participate somehow in the Divine Reason for the last basis of a true judgment. And this is the capital truth which commands all the discussions of the Schools and which more than the question of the manner of illumination is the central preoccupation of St. Augustine.

Jolivet's book is direct and informing, the texts of the Saint are well marshalled and handled, the Aristotelian formulas are shown in their true light—these have misled many—he leads the reader carefully up to the fundamental difficulty. If he has failed, he has 'failed gallantly.'

J. P. RABY.

REVIEWS

MISCELLANEOUS

ST. PATRICK. By Eoin Macneill. (Sheed & Ward ; 3/6.)

Scholars to whom legend is not history, yet enshrines history, are patiently recovering the *vera effigies* of the man who might almost be said to have rediscovered the apostolic life. It is not generally realized how narrowly the early Christian Church was confined, for good or evil, within the Roman Empire. National institutions shut the door of the Eastern peoples to the Gospel. Outside the Roman Empire Persia alone gave any vital tolerance to the Church of the Crucified. Yet Persia rivalled imperial Rome in its fierce outbursts of persecution, until the day when Jesus was treated as an undesirable alien.

In view of the fact that the Catholic Church was almost literally the Roman Catholic Church, the conversion of a free, intelligent, warlike, civilized people outside the *Pax Romana* was almost an unparalleled phenomenon. That this conversion was designed and accomplished by a Roman nobleman, once a slave in Ireland, is itself an event of first magnitude; that it was accomplished without bloodshed, amongst a notedly warlike people, gives it the character, not of mere human, but of divine direction.

When history is finally making up its mind about St. Patrick's importance not only to the fifth century, but to all succeeding centuries, studies like this unobtrusive book of Professor Macneill will be of necessity. The writer of this latest study on the runaway slave was born and reared too near to the hill of Sleamish not to forget the sublime self-effacing of the slave who came back with gifts to his old slave-master.

There is not a line in this little book that does not proclaim the scholar who prizes scholarship and loves his hero by fitly praising him with the artlessness of truth.

To this fine scholarship we venture to add a slender contribution. On page 14 we find a quotation from St. Patrick's *Confession*, ' . . . I have not studied as have others who most fittingly have drunk in *both Law and Holy Scripture alike*.' It seems to the present writer that in this phrase we have one of the earliest—if not the earliest—references to what may be called the curriculum of priestly studies. If our view of the passage is correct, historians of educational methods will find the *Confession* of St. Patrick a document of prime importance. There would seem no doubt that by *Law* St. Patrick meant the body of moral and ecclesiastical precepts which later on grew into the vast subject of *Moral Theology*.

By the word *Holy Scripture* St. Patrick meant what we now call *Dogmatic Theology*. Students of the history of priestly

education need no reminding that even down to the close of the thirteenth century ' Holy Scripture ' and ' Theology ' were synonymous.

VINCENT McNABB, O.P.

I. JAMES WHITTAKER. (Rich & Cowan ; 7/6.)

This book is of great interest in several ways. It is the story, by a young man of 28, born in the slums of Edinburgh, and now a greaser in Rochdale, of his desperate efforts to lead an intelligent human life within the framework of our civilization. This grim narrative of admirable courage, told without ostentation, is well worth reading for its own sake ; in the fewness of his years James Whittaker has had more experience of ' reality ' than members of the comfortable classes manage to obtain by the time they die.

The author draws no conclusions ; he has no thesis ; he does not ' indict ' modern society. He simply tells his story. But his restraint does not exempt us from reflection. The book compels us to think ; particularly compels Catholics to think. We cannot bluff ourselves by assuming that this is an exceptional case ; of course it is exceptional in the sense that of the millions who suffer, only very few are able to express their suffering ; the masses are inarticulate ; but any serious investigation would show that the conditions here revealed, far from being exceptional, represent the common distress of our proletariat. The general fact that emerges is that in this country there are still two nations, that equality in any real sense is a miserable myth, that social justice is intolerably lacking. It is a fact to which Catholics must awaken. If we desire to bring in the social reign of Jesus Christ, we must remember that He is a Ruler whose subjects have an equal *right* to the means not only for a decent natural human life, but also for a life befitting those who are called to be the sons of God. If we fail to follow the Holy Father and refuse to put social justice in the forefront of our programme, we are betraying the people to whom we offer the Gospel and justify the accusation that religion is a dope for their evils.

There are two incidental problems brought out by this story. The first is that of education. In England education is still governed by class privilege. For wage-earners of the working-class, access to a first-rate education is almost always an impossibility. The amiable theory that any boy of ability can climb the intellectual and social ladder is perniciously untrue. Once now and then such a boy has luck ; that is all that can be said. There are countless others of equal ability whom economic circumstances crush down and keep down. James Whit-

REVIEWS

taker has the instincts of a student; all his life he has striven to obtain that knowledge which is necessary for a reasonable human development. He has had to face the enduring obstacle of sordid poverty, endless disappointments and, finally, chronic ill health. Given the present 'established disorder,' given a civilization which is the enemy of the human person, the story is inevitable.

The second problem is that of the essential instability of the working career of wage-earners who do not belong to the strictly skilled class. Apprenticeship is almost non-existent; a boy leaves school at 14 and drifts aimlessly into any sort of a job. No thought can be given as to his suitability for the particular work, or as to the character of the employer. Consequently he shifts from job to job, never finding his professional vocation, never achieving a real function in society. This phenomenon of rootless individuals is terribly widespread, and it is fundamentally immoral. Having no organic position in the commonwealth such workers are literally outcasts, and it is by this characteristic that Marx defines the proletariat. The unfinished Odyssey of James Whittaker, the abrupt transitions from occupation to occupation, from town to town, will give the gentle reader a clear vision of how a human being born into this situation is able to cope with it. Comforting thoughts need not be expected.

There is only one solution for this particular issue. When it is a question of environment an effort to salvage individuals is totally inadequate. What must be done is to create in that environment by means of the workers themselves, Christian *institutions*, that provide an integral formation (intellectual, professional, religious, moral, artistic, social, and physical, *i.e.*, embracing *every* aspect of life), for all young workers and working girls from 14 to about 25. In this way alone can the wastage of these uniquely valuable years be prevented and the environment transformed.

Many other points arise in this book—*e.g.*, the unreality and anaemia of religion that is unrelated to the social situation, the author's sound diagnosis of Spiritualism, the psychological effects of machinery, etc. There is no space to discuss them here, and in any case they are all bound up with the question of formation mentioned above. A word must be added, however, about the book regarded purely as literature. James Whittaker wants to be a writer. He can certainly tell a story, describe an event in a concise, vivid way. He can look at an object with detachment and sometimes make it into a symbol. The incidents selected from his childhood, his journey to and life on the island, his employment during the war at Liverpool Docks, and accounts of life within the factories and of the

'leisure' hours outside them—all these are well done and live in the memory. The literary fault of the book lies in its construction; if it had been built up by more precisely marked-off incidents it would have gained in force. Its present continuity tends to be muddling. Further, the author must learn that our language is clogged with dead metaphors for natural beauty, and that advertisements have killed superlatives. If he prunes vigorously and achieves a universal detachment (autobiography is a dangerous experiment for a young writer, and only a faith in something bigger than himself will liberate him), there is no reason why the hope that has survived all his setbacks should not be fulfilled.

Mr. Whittaker, like every honest artist, hopes to make some money through his book, especially for his wife and child. He richly deserves to.

AELFRIC MANSON, O.P.

DOSTOIEVSKY. An Interpretation by Nicholas Berdyaev. Translated by Donald Attwater. (Sheed & Ward; 6/-.)

An able and useful attempt to achieve the impossible task of producing a manual of Dostoevskyism, a systematic account of Dostoevsky's conception of the world to which, the author acknowledges, he has added a considerable part of his own. The work, otherwise admirable, is vitiated throughout by its naïve and far-fetched interpretation of the crucial *Legend of the Grand Inquisitor*. The author shirks the deep problem of the *Legend* by presenting it in terms of the struggle between Christianity and Bolshevism! He assumes, in common with previous interpreters, that the *Legend* represents an irreducible antithesis, thereby ignoring the final reconciliation of Jesus and the Inquisitor. He is consequently compelled (since he cannot ignore totally its obvious import) to conclude that 'in his religious conceptions Dostoevsky never attained a total unity.' Doubtless, as M. Berdyaev says, he misunderstood Catholicism. But we believe that there was no inconsistency between his philosophy of freedom and his attachment to institutional Orthodoxy, but that he was fundamentally in sympathy with Soloviev's 'free theocracy,' which M. Berdyaev dismisses as a self-contradiction. Is it not more in accord with his thought and conduct to see in his figure of the Prisoner and the Inquisitor, not two irreconcilably opposed forces, but two complementary elements in essential Christianity, opposed only when functioning independently, the spirit without the body and the body without the spirit? At least we cannot lightly attribute a glaring inconsistency to 'Russia's greatest metaphysician.' He was, perhaps, less *simplicite* than even the best of his countless interpreters.

VICTOR WHITE, O.P.

REVIEWS

TWO HUNDRED FOLK CAROLS. Edited by Sir Richard R. Terry, Mus.Doc., F.R.C.O. (Burns Oates; 18/-.)

Carols, like folk-songs, are pre-eminently a national product, and the carols of each nation should be studied separately. This book scores in its method by grouping the carols into nations or districts. Thus we have English Traditional, English Medieval (both already reviewed in these pages), French, Besançon, Béarnaise and Burgundian, Provençal, Basque, Dutch and Flemish, German and Polish, and European Medieval groups. It is the most splendid and complete book of carols which has yet appeared in this country. Its scholarship is guaranteed by the name of its editor, and many are the exquisite tunes with which he has presented us in their best and original forms. One could wish perhaps that some of the harmonizations had been lighter and simpler; too thick an underlaying, such as he gives at times, tends to obscure the melody—they verge occasionally even on the sentimental. Perhaps this is churlish, since carols are mainly intended for unison singing, as he points out. The literary side of the book is perfect. The old English words stand on their own, and Latin words are frequently given as well; for the foreign carols, there are lovely versions by excellent translators.

The exterior of the book is pleasing, and the interior has many good points, black and readable type, indices of the titles of foreign carols, and of first lines. One could have wished for a metrical index. It seems a pity that it should be so costly, but the wealth of its contents makes up for its cost. In any case, it need not frighten choirmasters, because all the parts may be obtained separately at prices from 3/6 to 1/-, and it is not necessary to buy them all at once. This separation of the parts has led to a very inconvenient pagination; each one starts afresh, but the possessor of the complete volume need not be worried by this when he realises that the numbers of the carols are continuous.

FRANCIS MONCRIEFF, O.P.

THE PLAY

The *Duchess of Malfi*, which has been revived at the Embassy, is not, as it is often loosely termed, Elizabethan, but Jacobean, and its whole tenor is illustrative of the changed spirit of the later period. The playwright seeks no longer the creation of characters of mythical grandeur, seeming to move in a world of their own. In Webster, creation is doubled by analysis; he presents us here with an almost Freudian study of how pathological cruelty may spring from unrecognized lust; while

BLACKFRIARS

his scenes of horror, so fantastic that they can hardly carry conviction to a modern audience, are the more incredible because many of his personages have an every-day and even modern humanity. They have, in particular, a self-consciousness absent in the Elizabethans; moral motives become more explicit, the words 'sin,' 'conscience,' recur constantly. Even the villain Bosola analyses his acts, half-hearted in his blackest villanies, till the murder of the Duchess, once accomplished, shocks him unto unavailing repentance. Nor does the murder end the play; a whole subsequent act is devoted to the moral disintegration of its perpetrators, whose death is the final climax. Here, in a setting of melodrama, we have the beginning of that deliberate reflection on the workings of the human mind that was one of the characteristics of the seventeenth century.

The production is on the whole very good, though time-limits have made over-drastring cutting inevitable. The lovely part of the Duchess, with her wit and courage and natural gaiety, her tragic grandeur in unendurable misery: 'I am Duchess of Malfi still'—with the maternal tenderness that made her last words recommend her maid to give her little boy 'some syrup for his cough, and teach the girl to say her prayers'—this part was played with grace and dignity by Miss Joyce Bland. Mr. Neil Porter adequately conveyed the cold malice of her brother the Cardinal, while the second brother, Fernando, all passion, animal man without restraint of reason, was rendered with convincing temperament by Mr. John Laurie.

If seventeenth century classics are always of interest, modern classics are perhaps even more so. And it is as a classic that I count Mr. Denis Johnston's *The Moon in the Yellow River* at the Haymarket. It gives a sense of an underlying pattern of metaphysic; you look through the play, in itself alive and coherent, as through a window opening on vaster issues. A German engineer, Catholic, romantic, drawn by poetic enthusiasm for Ireland, comes to dedicate himself to her service, installing a great electrical power station. A part of Ireland, represented by the Free State soldier, eagerly accepts this symbol of Modern Progress. But the elfish Ireland of Synge's *Playboy* rejects it as alien to her spirit; she destroys the German's power-station and breaks his heart, as she has broken the heart of innumerable lovers. (One thinks of Erskine Childers, and, in fiction, though surely typical and observed from life, of Canon Sheehan's *New Curate*.) The characterization, the dialogue, the tragic plot, the humorous relief, are all masterly; production and acting are worthy of what is among the finest plays of our time.

BARBARA BARCLAY CARTER.

REVIEWS

GRAMOPHONE

Three recent recordings of major works mark, as it were, the three Aristotelean moments in movement, the movement from the Classical to the Romantic, terms that are perhaps more historical than musical. First, Mozart's *Symphony in E Flat Major*. Some writers have seen in this work anticipations of the coming romanticism; but from the point of view of the biographer the non-musical preoccupation of the summer of 1788 was financial, and it would take a very imaginative psychologist to find traces of this in the three great symphonies (including the *Jupiter*) which were written then. Bruno Walter, with the B.B.C. Symphony Orchestra, has been content to give the *E Flat Major* without affectation, and the result is a sound and satisfying performance (DB 2258-60). Second, Beethoven's *Fifth Symphony*. This, with Schubert's *Unfinished* the most popular of symphonies, has been hailed as the glorious opening of the Romantic Movement. 'Here,' says Berlioz, who was a musician with a powerful pictorial imagination, 'here are his most private griefs, his fiercest wrath, his most lonely and desolate meditations, his midnight visions, his bursts of enthusiasm.' But the listener may neglect the 'fate knocking at the door' business in this grand monument of musical logic, and he will applaud the reading of it by Serge Koussevitsky and the London Philharmonic (DB 2338-42). The passage for 'cellos and basses in the Trio, likened by Berlioz to the gambolling of elephants (comment that is extravagant in degree, yet really not different in kind from most literary criticism of Beethoven), comes through with unusual clarity and precision, indeed the entire recording of this symphony and the Mozart is first-rate. Third, Schumann's *Sonata No. 2 in D Minor* for pianoforte and violin. It abounds in typical lyrical subjects; Hephzibah and Yehudi Menuhin are the invigorators (DB 2264-67).

The record of Jascha Heifetz playing Wieniawski's *Scherzo Tarantelle* and the *Largo on the G String* from Clerambault (DB 2219) forms almost as effective a contrast as one of some years back with an air from Couperin on one side and the *Gollywog's Cakewalk* on the other. A tender and a jealous scene between Gertrude Lawrence and Douglas Fairbanks, Jr., from *Moonlight is Silver* (C 2710), is an attractive character piece. Then there is a new Gigli (DA 1373); two Silly Symphony noises and voices, *The Wise Little Hen* and *The Grasshopper and the Ants* (B 6555); a musical condensation by Stokowski of the last Act of *Parsifal* (DB 2272-3); and the overture to *Ruy Blas* brilliantly rescued from the brass bands by Dr. Adrian Boult (DB 2365).

(Key.—H.M.V. DB series, 6/- each; DA series, 4/- each; C series, 4/- each; B series, 2/6 each.)

T.L.

NOTICES

VOODOOISM IN MUSIC. By Sir Richard R. Terry. (Burns Oates; 3/6.)

The aim of this book of collected articles is to 'get at' the plain man and make music more understandable and less of a mystery guarded only by the initiate, an admirable object which it achieves excellently, in non-technical terms. Sir Richard Terry's common-sense but expert and scholarly pen attacks readily (the humour sometimes a little strained) the degenerate element in jazz, the 'gift of music' legend, the tyrant piano, the scoffers at mechanical music, the obstinacy of parish choirs which *will* not be reformed; and explains simply polyphonic music, describes medieval choirs, throws carol-singing into its true light, and discusses with splendid courage the difficult problem of vernacular hymns. Any plain man who has even a passing interest in music ought willingly to deliver himself up to be 'got at,' and read this book. (F.M.)

A new edition of A GRAMMAR OF PLAINSONG by a Benedictine of Stanbrook (paper 3/-, cloth 3/6) has been published. It is still one of the best introductory books to the practical study of the subject. The new edition is improved by a recasting of the chapter on Rhythm, and an additional one on Transcription.

Part II of PLAINSONG FOR SCHOOLS (paper 6½d., cloth 10d.) contains many useful things: the Proper of the Mass for principal feasts, Litanies of the Saints, Sunday Vespers, and Hymns for various occasions. There is also a COMPANION to Part I (price 6d.) consisting of a literal translation of the words contained in it. The purpose is to assist teachers to explain exactly what the Latin means. This is a sound idea, because a proper religious interpretation of the Chant is essentially bound up with the understanding of its meaning. All these books are published by Rushworth and Dreaper. (F.M.)

The eight chapters of Mr. L. V. Lester-Garland's THE IDEA OF THE SUPERNATURAL (S.P.C.K., 5/-) bear such titles as 'Belief in a Personal God,' 'The Modern Philosophy of Nature,' 'The Freedom of the Will.' As these indicate, the book covers a wider field than would be conveyed by its title understood in the strict meaning current in Catholic theology. It is concerned to maintain the foundations on which any true religion must rest, and the eight essays which compose it are evidently the result of wide reading and sincere thinking. There are, of course, passages which a Catholic would find it difficult to accept, but as a

NOTICES

quiet, even exposition by a judicious mind at home in ancient and modern thought and anxious to preserve what is good in both, the book is to be highly commended. (L.W.)

A STUART PORTRAIT, a Study of Elizabeth Queen of Bohemia, by Alice Buchan (Peter Davies, 7/6) deserves notice, for it is the work of a new writer who achieves a definite measure of success in that very difficult *genre*, the modern imaginative biography. As a character study it is lively and consistent; as a study in the seventeenth century it is weak only where it is not original; thus there is the customary absence of references and a conventional over-emphasis on the felicity of Elizabethan England, on the lack of personal dignity in King James, on the religious aspect of the Thirty Years' War. But it is successful where it is most personal, and the characterization of the Queen's children shows an admirable sense of the individual. (G.M.)

ARCHBISHOP DOWNEY reprints a number of papers on theological, philosophical and scientific subjects in CRITICAL AND CONSTRUCTIVE ESSAYS (Burns Oates; 5/-). Evolution, Comparative Religion, Personal Immortality, Aquinas and Aristotle, Psychology and Psycho-Analysis, the Reunion of Christendom, are among the subjects dealt with.

A new edition of Fr. Hugh Pope's THE LAYMAN'S NEW TESTAMENT in 930 pages has been issued by Messrs. Sheed and Ward for 3/6. The work has been enlarged and very thoroughly revised, and many who possess the old edition will be glad to possess this more handsome volume as well.

STARS WERE BORN. By Barbara Lucas. (Constable; 7/6.)

A cinematic study of a passing phase; a girl of 16 in the classroom of a London day school between 4.15 and 4.30 on an autumn afternoon. Viewed from such a standpoint this first novel is perfect in its achievement, a compressed *Ulysses*. The long interlacing plots lose much of their significance if they are followed slowly and chronologically. The future of Petra as a married woman, with £450 a year and a swarm of children, like the future of the almost identical Domenica at Paris with her many lovers, is quite unconvincing as fact and very convincing as dream. Many of the cast like Noel Corbett, fair haired in his black felt hat, at a restaurant at Ostia or Guy Shewring, short and solid in a London *Brasserie*, retain throughout a photographic realism admirably fitting them to be phantasms. Among such motion-pictures Domenica at school stays integrally spontaneously alive. Thus stars were born. (V.G.)

BLACKFRIARS

BOOKS RECEIVED

- BLACKWELL (Oxford): *Abailard's Ethics (Know Thyself)*, tr. with introduction by J. Ramsay McCullum, M.A., Foreword by Kenneth E. Kirk, D.D. (6/-).
- BLOT (Paris): *Le Corps mystique du Christ. Synthèse de théologie dogmatique, ascétique et mystique*, Ernest Mura, Préface du R. P. Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., 2 vols. (Frs. 30).
- BLOUD ET GAY (Paris): *Eucharistia*, Symposium. (Frs. 60).
- BURNS OATES: *The Word Incarnate: A Harmony of the Gospels*, Abp. Goodier, S.J. (5/-); *The Catholic Directory 1935* (3/6); *The Catholic Who's Who 1935* (5/-).
- CHAPMAN AND HALL: *The Communist Answer to the World's Needs*, Julius Hecker, Ph.D. (8/6); *Marxism*, J. Middleton Murry, John Macmurray, N. A. Holdaway, G. D. H. Cole (5/-).
- CITE CHRETIENNE (Brussels): *Manuel d'Action Catholique: Essai théorique*, Mgr. Luigi Civardi, tr. de l'italien par le Chan J. Claes (B. frs. 20); *Au fil de l'année liturgique*, Jacques Leclercq (B. frs. 20).
- DESCLEE DE BROUWER (Paris): *Pour un ordre catholique*, Etienne Gilson (Frs. 10); *Le pratique de la présence de Dieu*, Fr. Laurent de la Resurrection, convers carme dechaussé, ed. Louis van den Bossche (Frs. 10); *Stendhal, l'homme et l'œuvre*, Pierre Jourda (Frs. 20).
- DOMINICANA (Washington, D.C.): *Dominican Calendar 1935* (2 cents.)
- HAAS UND GRABHERR (Augsburg): *Die Religiöse Formkraft des Katholizismus in der Zeit*, F. X. Landmesser (RM. 1.20).
- HEINEMANN: *The Accuracy of the Bible*, Dr. A. S. Yahuda (10/6).
- INSTITUTO STORICO DOMENICANO (S. Sabina, Rome): *The Authorship of the Ancien Riwle*, V. McNabb, O.P. (no price); *Archivum FF. Praedicatorum: Tomus III* (Frs. 60).
- MCLAUGHLIN AND REILLY (Boston, Mass.): *Melodiae Sacrae*, Books I and III, Melchior Mauro-Cottone (no price); *Proper of the Mass for all Sundays of the Year*, Theo. Labouré, O.M.I. (no price).
- OUSELEY: *A Modern Magdalen (Eve Lavallière)*, L. McReavy (3/6); *St. Joseph Cottolengo*, H. L. Hughes (2/6).
- PEPLER AND SEWELL (Ditchling Common): *Welsh Ways and Days*, Eleanor Boniface.
- RICH AND COWAN: *Mary Stuart, Forgotten Shrines*, Revd. edn., Sir George Turner (6/-).
- SANDS: *St. Bernadette of Lourdes, A Saint of the Golden Legend*, François Dohourcau, tr. W. J. Anderson (5/-).
- S.P.C.K.: *The Old Testament in the Light of Anthropology*, E. O. James, D.Litt., Ph.D., F.S.A. (4/-).
- 'SPES' (Paris): *L'humanisme et l'humain, Psychologie individuelle et sociale*, F. Charmot, S.J. (Frs. 30); *L'Eglise et la femme*, Colette Yver (Frs. 12); *La Vie, est-elle un jête?* J. Choquet (pp. 100, no price); *Le Problème de l'Apostolat dans le monde moderne*, Mgr. de Solages (pp. 255, no price); *Le Miracle de l'Eglise; l'Eternité dans le Temps*, A.-D. Serpillanges, O.P. (pp. 252, no price).
- STUDENT CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT PRESS: *Church, Community and State*, J. H. Oldham, introduction by the Bp. of Chichester (1/-).
- A Selection of these Books will be reviewed in due course.*

Printed in Great Britain by the Oxonian Press, Oxford, and published for the Proprietors by The Rolls House Publishing Co., Ltd., Rolls House, 2 Breame Buildings, London, E.C.4.

Catholic Times

Diamond Jubilee Year

1935 is our Diamond Jubilee Year, and we hope to celebrate it both by consolidating the progress of the past year, and by pressing still more vigorously forward. Our circulation, based solely on the worth of the paper and not on 'stunts' or specious advertising, is still rising steadily.

SPECIAL FEATURES

During 1934 we aimed at giving our readers series of special articles by acknowledged authorities, including, for example, THE SCHOOLS QUESTION by the Bishop of Pella; THE CHURCH AND FASCISM by Mr. Christopher Dawson and others; THE SLUMS by Father Martindale; and THE VOCATION OF THE LAY-BROTHER by various Religious. At present we are publishing a series on

THE MASS, by DOM CABROL, O.S.B.

As a celebration of our Jubilee we are hoping to produce a companion picture to 'The Breaking of the Storm.' It will portray in a dramatic setting Blessed John Fisher and Blessed Thomas More, and will be painted by Dom Pedro Subercaseaux.

REGULAR FEATURES

LATEST HOME AND FOREIGN NEWS.

A TRENCHANT LEADER PAGE (widely quoted in Europe and America).

CHILDREN'S AND HOME PAGES.

DRAWINGS by Joseph Pike. BOOKS. MUSIC. ART.

'The Times' Looks AND IS the Best.

BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE LTD.

READY IN FEBRUARY

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH UNDER HENRY VIII

Edited by CHARLES A. NEWDIGATE, S.J.

In view of this year's centenary, Fr. Newdigate, who is Vice-Postulator of the Cause of the English Martyrs, has compiled this very remarkable series of extracts from Stow's *Annals of England*. Catholic Colleges, and all students of the period, will find this an invaluable compilation. *Wrapper, 1/6*

PRAYERS TO THE ENGLISH MARTYRS

Compiled by W. RAEMERS, C.S.S.R.

In this little book are gathered together for the first time the Mass and Collects of the English Martyrs, their own last words of prayer, and the authorised hymns, prayers and devotions, written in their honour.

Wrapper, 1/-; Cloth, 1/6

MORE PILGRIM WAYS

F. I. COWLES

Continuing his journey in search of England's ancient shrines which attracted so many readers to his *Pilgrim Ways*, Mr. Cowles now completes his circuit through north-eastern England, working his way round to Lancashire and St. Winefride's Well.

Illustrated, Cloth 3/6

56 YEARS A MISSIONARY IN CHINA

MOTHER ST. AUSTIN

Prefaces by Archbishop Goodier, S.J., and The Bishop of Nanking

An absorbing account of the life of Mother St. Dominic and her many heroic years in the Missions of China.

Illustrated, Cloth 5/-

EARLY IRISH LAWS AND INSTITUTIONS

EOIN MacNEILL, D.Litt.

Challenges the widespread belief that European civilisation is almost exclusively the result of Latin culture. Will provoke much controversy. *Cloth, 5/-*

ETHICS OF PEACE AND WAR

H. GIGON, Ph.D.

Foreword by Lord Howard of Penrith.

A concise and admirably clear exposition of scholastic theory examining the fundamental principles and their application to the problems of a just war and of preserving peace.

Wrapper, 2/-

43 NEWGATE ST., E.C.1 and 129 VICTORIA ST., S.W.1

And at **MANCHESTER, BIRMINGHAM, GLASGOW and DUBLIN**